Class 282.44R Book Sp26
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

FRENCH CATHOLICS
IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

FRENCH CATHOLICS

IN THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

BY

W. J. SPARROW-SIMPSON, D.D.,

CHAPLAIN OF S. MARY'S HOSPITAL, ILFORD

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY NEW YORK

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

LONDON: 68 HAYMARKET, S.W.
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.

1918

282.44R

Sp26

65764

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

18 8 '19

PREFACE

THERE is much for us English Church people to learn from the experiences of Catholics in France during the nineteenth century. It is hoped that the following pages may form an introduction to a very interesting study. Parts of these essays were printed in various numbers of the *English Church Review*. They are here collected together with considerable additions. The list of books in the Appendix will show the main sources, and may be useful to those who are inclined to pursue the subject for themselves.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Lamennais	9
II.	Lacordaire	41
III.	Montalembert	77
IV.	Louis Veuillot	107
V.	Gratry	122
VI.	Emile Ollivier	143
VII.	D'Hulst and Duchesne	164
VIII.	D'Hulst and Loisy	177

FRENCH CATHOLICS

IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

I

LAMENNAIS

THE career of Lamennais, born in 1782, died in 1854, has become of late an object of new interest in French literature. It is felt that the common estimate of his value requires revision. A considerable series of letters and documents, hitherto unpublished, has recently appeared, greatly adding to the knowledge to be derived from the sixteen-volume edition of his collected writings.

The life of an Ultramontane who became a Deist inevitably presents the sharpest contrasts. Honoured by one Pope, condemned by another; master of distinguished disciples, and abandoned by them all; winning by his genius, and repelling by his asperities; craving for sympathy, yet flinging it away: intolerant of social life, yet crushed by solitude; meteoric alike in brilliancy and eclipse; alternating between noble conceptions and small-minded perversities; singularly capable in intellect yet practically as helpless as a child; merciless in criticism, yet acutely sensitive; afflicted with constant ill-health and the morbid depression of a Breton temperament; logical and

imaginative; martyr to noble aims, unworldly, superior to all personal ambitions while serenely conscious of his power: Lamennais is certainly a psychological study of exceptional interest.

He was a difficult, unruly child, subject to violent fits of ungovernable fury, the terror of his various private instructors, who sometimes gave him up in despair. Everything was as abnormal in his training as in his nature. A motherless, companionless being, left in his uncle's charge, locked in a library as a precaution against mischief, he read with avidity, but not always with discretion. There was something almost uncanny in his precocious imagination. The child who, among a group of elders viewing a landscape could say, "They gaze on what I gaze, but they cannot see what I can see," was, if he really said so, at least unusual.

Lamennais won his reputation by the famous Essay on "Indifference in Matters of Religion." The indifference which he criticized was not the moral inconsistency of those who practically ignore what they theoretically acknowledge, but rather indifference of the intellectual or philosophical kind. Lamennais classified theoretical indifference to Religion in three divisions. The first includes those who see in Religion nothing more than a political creation, necessary only for the masses of mankind. The second includes those who recognize the necessity of Religion for every man, but deny the reality of Revelation. The third contains those who acknowledge the necessity of a revealed Religion, but deny its contents, except certain articles which they consider fundamental. In other words, the three objects of Lamennais' critique are the Agnostic, the Deist, and the Protestant.

The author brought all the force of his logic and raillery to bear on these three types. It must be owned that he was an advocate pure and simple, with all the mere advocate's defects, engaged in refuting an opponent rather than in converting a man. He was not infrequently quite unfair. He freely pours contempt and disdain. He indulges in abuse. He sometimes demolishes what he has first misrepresented and caricatured. Yet he riddled the antagonistic positions through and through. He demonstrated other men's inconsequence in an inimitably brilliant, if exasperating, way.

The work was a signal triumph within the Church of France. Its author rose at once into world-wide reputation. No French writer, it was declared, had held such ascendancy since the days of Bossuet.

When Lamennais visited Rome in 1824, he went with the reputation of one of the ablest living Apologists for Catholicism. Everywhere in Rome he was received with the greatest distinction. He was lodged with the Jesuits. He found his own portrait one of the adornments of the Pope's writing-table. Leo XII. intended to make him Cardinal. He was at the height of papal favour.

But the first volume of the Essay was only the introduction to Lamennais' Apologetic scheme. He launched a second volume, which is in reality an Essay on the Problem of Religious Certainty. His method of procedure is first to demonstrate the insecurity of the individual reason. Reason is the frailest barrier against doubt. There is no truth which reason has left intact. There is nothing which cannot be alike asserted or denied by its aid. Lamennais exerts all his reason to prove the instability of

reason, and to undermine and demolish the mighty structures which the intellect has created. The end of all human reasonings is uncertainty. Are we not wholly dependent for reasoning upon the material which memory provides? Entirely at the mercy of that mysterious faculty, the intellect plays with the ideas which it has blindly received. But who can certify the trustworthiness of memory? There, too, our reasoning rests on axioms which may be no better than illusions, after all. Are not the methods of our reasoning purely relative to our nature? Who shall assure us that any essential correspondence exists between Reality and the activities of our human minds? Even the Cartesian assurance, "I think, therefore I exist," requires for its validity the assumption that self-deception is impossible, and the further assumption that necessary Being exists in Whom alone the individual reason can find its ultimate justification.

This is thorough-going indeed. The only certain thing is that there is nothing certain. Behold us, then, reduced to complete agnosticism and uncertainty; plunged in the depths of universal insecurity. But no, not in the least. This onslaught on reason is mere preliminary clearing of the ground. Lamennais now begins to build. He proceeds secondly that while it is impossible to find in the isolated reason the foundation upon which its conclusions rest, it is equally impossible for man to remain in a state of uncertainty. It is impossible for him to do otherwise than acknowledge certain things as true. He has convictions which are not only in conformity with his nature, they are his very nature itself, since they are what it is impossible for him to surmount. To destroy

them would be to destroy his rationality and indeed his very existence.

This being the constitution of our nature, the question must be faced, What is the general principle which determines our belief? Lamennais answers that it is the common consent of mankind. For the faith or assurance of the individual human reason is invariably feeble when it finds itself alone. It strengthens in proportion as it is supported by external authority. Thus, according to Lamennais, the main proof of the existence of God is the unanimous consent of all nations. The difference between the sceptical and the believing is not so much intellectual as that the one rejects, while the other accepts, the general reason of humanity. And he who rejects the general reason does not reasonably believe anything whatever. For since he has affirmed the insecurity of the universal reason he can have no assurance for the security of the individual reason. But if the existence of God is acknowledged on the authority of the universal reason, the individual acquires a foundation for the ideas which he previously found himself compelled to accept while unable to explain.

Authority, therefore, is the general means for discerning true religion; true religion being that which rests upon the greatest outward visible authority. Lamennais introduces here the further view that there must be an external visible means to determine doubts, and that such external authority must be endowed with certainty. He then glides from the universal reason to the testimony of the Roman Church, and expects his readers to find in the Pope the satisfaction of the demand for certainty.

This second or constructive part of Lamennais'

critique was received in France with very mingled feelings. His strenuous advocacy of authority in religion was of course approved. But his attack on reason was held to have gone too far. If reason was as incapable as Lamennais affirmed, what became of the traditional intellectual proofs of Deity? These startling innovations on traditional method disconcerted and alarmed the conservative theologians, who thought that this ascription of ultimate authority to the general consent of mankind confused the authority of the Church with the authority of the world. Lamennais, indeed, had attempted to bridge the chasm between the two, but he had not really succeeded. He had not been able to distinguish the natural authority of the testimony of mankind to religious truth from the supernatural authority of the testimony of the Church. Accordingly, it was felt that Lamennais' constructive work was a magnificent failure; a brilliant effort conceived with the best intentions, but after all a dangerous and compromising production. It was correctly felt that the author was a man of genius, but neither a historian nor a philosopher, nor least of all a theologian. In his desire to elevate authority he had exaggerated the incompetence of reason, and had built his constructions on a basis which his own criticisms had rendered insecure.

This was widely felt. A battle royal arose. The apologist was attacked more within his own communion than without. He affected at first a lordly disdain and declined to reply. He would leave the decision to the judgment of time. But the younger clergy rallied round him, and his power and influence greatly increased.

The stormy and tragic part of Lamennais' career

began when he adopted the rôle of an ecclesiastical politician. The general principles pervading the ranks of the higher clergy of France in 1824 were largely Gallican. They adhered to the famous declaration drawn up by Bossuet under the direction of Louis XIV. in 1682. These principles placed the final authority in Christendom in the Collective Episcopate and not in the Pope; thus repudiating the despotic centralization of the Ultramontane. Theoretically, therefore, the Bishops of France possessed independent authority; but practically they had become subservient to the power of the State by which they were nominated and supported. The concordat between Napoleon and Pius VII. in 1801 left the State and the Church combined. The nomination of Bishops was still in imperial control. And now, what Lamennais contemplated with infinite disgust, there was the payment of the clergy by the State. Meanwhile, there came the rise of Democracy, which the Church could never hope to win unless it was entirely dissociated from the State. Democracy denoted freedom. Monarchy had represented despotism. So long as Church and monarchy were combined the democratic detestation of the one would include the other also. Lamennais saw no remedy but in the Ultramontane conception of union with centralized power in Rome. In season and out of season he advocated these theories in the journals of the day.[1]

In his book on Religion, considered in its relations with the political and civil order, Lamennais claimed that a religious corporation had the right of self-management within the State just as an individual, and that despotic centralization of political power

[1] 1825, *Works*, t. vii.

invaded the true liberties of the people. He said that the attempt of the State to control the Church in France was simply the creation of a civil Pope on the lines of Henry VIII. of England. Civil authority was regulating in France what the Bishops should order to be taught in their seminaries. Lamennais called a national Church the worst of servitudes. He characterized the Gallican independence as a schismatic spirit obstinately bent on diminishing the wholesome influence of the Holy See. French Bishops expected a deference to their own letters which they did not accord to those of the Pope. Lamennais did not hesitate to say that the Gallican liberties had become the war-cry of all the enemies of Christianity. Stronger and yet more uncompromising grew his assertions. Then out it came, his Ultramontanism, in the extremest form, defiant, exasperating: No Pope, no Church; no Church, no Christianity; no Christianity, no religion, and consequently no social life.

Lamennais' Roman biographer is a little scandalized by the logic of these propositions. No Pope no Church he is prepared from the Roman standpoint to admit. "But at the same time it would be false to assert that the Greek Church on the day it parted from the Holy See ceased to be a Christian Church." Lamennais' genius, however, did not lie in the direction of the careful qualification of ideas or the balance of truth with truth. He is as determined for despotic centralization in the Church as he is opposed to it in the State.

This production was very badly received by the French Episcopate. Most of them condemned it openly to their dioceses. Mgr. Frayssinous, whose name meant so much in France at that period both in the sphere of traditional apologetics and as the chief

living advocate of Gallican principles, exerted all his influence both with the Episcopate and with the Government against this daring Ultramontane. The result was that Lamennais was summoned before the police tribunal and fined, and his work ordered to be seized and destroyed.

All this hugely exasperated the critic of political despotism. Off he started again, as any prophet would, to re-affirm his principles in another document to replace the work condemned ; adding thereto many like words, and certainly not a whit less vehement.[1]

But the new work met a similar fate. It was denounced by the imperialist press as soon as it appeared. Mgr. de Quélen, Archbishop of Paris, condemned it in a pastoral as the work of an adventurous and presumptuous genius who raised his opinions to the level of dogmas and sowed discord and hatred between rulers and subjects.

Lamennais was enraged. He issued open letters to the Archbishop, masterly productions, incisive, brilliant, irritating, full of the undisguised contempt of a clever logician for the practical administrator who in the sphere of argument was no match for him.

Neither ecclesiastical nor political authority in France was equal to cope with Lamennais' brilliancy and popularity. Both, therefore, endeavoured to secure a condemnation of the offending documents at Rome. It is a singular situation. The Gallicans appealed to the Pope, who had no sympathy with them, to condemn the Ultramontane whose ecclesiasticism he approved. Rome, as might have been expected, took a middle course. It objected to Gallicans, but condoled with their troubles. It refused

[1] *On the Progress of the Revolution.*

to condemn the Ultramontane, but privately remonstrated with his excesses.

Rome, which agreed with his dislike of Gallican principles, neither shared his impatience nor adopted his methods. But the reformer could not endure this temporizing policy. He began, although only in private letters, to turn his impetuous and imperious criticisms on Rome. What particularly vexed him was the diplomatic hesitation of the Jesuits to commit themselves openly to his Ultramontane ideas. The traditional attitude of that powerful order towards Ultramontanism had been one of calculating prudence, than which nothing could be more distasteful to the disposition of Lamennais. He came, therefore, to view the order with deep disgust.

To promote Lamennais' principles as a liberal Ultramontane, the brilliant but short-lived daily journal the *Avenir* was created. It began in October, 1830, and ended in November, 1831. Lamennais was its heart and soul, although the articles were principally written by his school. Montalembert and Lacordaire were the most conspicuous. But there were also Gerbet and Salinis, afterwards Bishops, and Rohrbacher, the voluminous historian, whose thirty volumes on the history of the Church were designed to supersede the Gallican Fleury.

The whole profession of the *Avenir* was liberty. The seven volumes reprinted at Louvain are full of contemporary history.

First came the struggle over education. The University under Government control possessed the monopoly of teaching. No private school was permissible. And the influence of the University was opposed to all definite religion. This was felt by

Catholics as an intolerable restriction. It was this which provoked Montalembert and Lacordaire somewhat dramatically to open a private school in defiance of State authority. Montalembert when prosecuted for it informed the court that if he were a father he would prefer his children to linger in ignorance rather than expose them to the risk of losing their faith at the hands of the University. Against this monopoly in education the *Avenir* protested with acuteness and energy. It argued that in former ages, when religion was universally accepted throughout the nation, and the State was identified with it, parental rights were respected, since every father shared the common faith; but now that religious unity no longer exists, and the State as such is indifferent in matters of religion, every father must possess the freedom to exercise the natural right of imparting his religion to his child. The theory that the education of a child is the right of the State destroys the prerogative of fatherhood. And the monopoly of education by secular Universities, which is the practical outcome of that theory, is an intolerable violation of the natural right of the Home. The abolition of every educational monopoly was therefore essential to the ideas of liberty.

Secondly, there must be freedom of the Press. The State in France exercised at this period a despotic censorship over every public expression of opinion adverse to its own. Guizot's University lectures on history were closed abruptly by a Government which disliked his views. He accepted the closure with the philosophic air of a man who might have inflicted a similar penalty on his opponents had he been in power. Journalism was everywhere subject to vigilant scrutiny, and mercilessly warned, fined, and suppressed. The

Avenir in its short but lively career had on several occasions to announce that Government had confiscated the issue of the previous day.

Of all our liberties, said the *Avenir*, that which is dearest to many is the freedom of the Press. Repression of this freedom could only be dangerous to the Government which enacted it ; for repression provoked explosions on a wider and more disastrous scale. In any case centralization was the most formidable foe of public liberty. The only way to remedy abuses is to protest against them. And this is only possible when the Press is free. Literature is only an extended form of conversation, and ought to be subject to no more restraints.

It must be owned that Lamennais' use of the freedom of the Press was not calculated to commend that freedom to a nervous or cautious authority. When the Bishops found themselves apostrophized in impassioned terms to take heroic measures and to risk all consequence, they were naturally not a little resentful towards the irresponsible agent of revolutionary suggestions. Or when the Cardinal Secretary of State found himself accused, in a Catholic journal controlled by priests, of ignoring all the principles of criminal jurisprudence in his dealing with rebellion within the Papal States, and that in a document issued in the Pope's own name, he also may have had his own views on the advantages of the freedom of the Press. Or when Louis Philippe found his speeches criticized with a frankness which left nothing unsaid, and himself pilloried before the nation as being no Catholic, he too may have felt that unrestricted freedom was not beneficial to the unstable condition of his throne. Above all, when a Bishop of France, whose

only offence was that he held Gallican ideas, found himself alluded to as that unfortunate old man who kneels before every successive Government, and has ruled, or more truly desolated for several years, one of the finest dioceses in France, it was hardly to be expected that he as a member of the old *régime* with despotical traditions should desire to confer larger freedom of language upon his priests.

Thirdly, the *Avenir* demanded freedom to form communities. As the law of France then stood, not only was the formation of new communities forbidden, but the continuance of those already in existence was disallowed. This led to painful scenes and tragic results. There could be no more forcible example than the celebrated case of the Trappists of Meilleray. This community had been driven out of France by the Revolution. For five and twenty years they were refugees in England, where they lived in quiet prosperity, known for their success in agricultural pursuits. When Louis XVIII. ascended to the throne, being anxious to collect the scattered resources of the nation, he expressly invited them to return to France. He sent a frigate to carry them home at the Government expense. They bought some land in France, and converted it by their agricultural labours into a prosperous and fertile estate. Then came the fatal law against association. The Abbey of Meilleray was invaded and confiscated by a detachment of French soldiers. Protests and appeals were vain. The community was dispersed. The English Consul took the English section under his protection and sent them to this country. But the Abbey of Meilleray was left a desolate wilderness.

This story was told and retold with every sensational

circumstance in the columns of the *Avenir*. The exasperation of the Catholic world was natural. The illogical procedure of a State expelling those whom it had expressly invited to return ; the injustice of such treatment to men who, relying on the word of France, had sunk their resources in French estates ; was set before a logical people with all the sarcasm and indignation of which the brilliant group of writers was capable. They demanded with every possible insistence the right of freedom to form associations and communities.

According to Guizot, however, there was another side to the case. France was overrun by secret societies, in revolutionary interests, which threatened the safety of the nation and the stability of the throne. The Government was nervous and weak. The conduct of the mobs in Paris intolerable. The authorities saw no alternative but to prohibit all associations, by a law which was only designed to meet a temporary emergency, but was unable to discriminate between the harmless and the bad. The innocent was punished for the guilty in order to save the State. The disordered conditions of France precluded the concessions which the advocates of freedom demanded. Such is Guizot's defence.

Fourthly, the *Avenir* demanded freedom in worship. Conflict between Church and State arose over the burial of the dead. A conference of lawyers in Paris held that if a priest refused to take the burial service the mayor had the right to force open the door of the church and to bring in the corpse. This conflict reached a crisis in the case of Grégoire, the constitutional Bishop. Here was an ecclesiastic whose orders were of unquestioned validity, but who in the eyes of

Rome was a Gallican and a schismatic. Grégoire was old and dying. The question was who would bury him. This question the *Avenir* discussed under the curiously unedifying title of "l'Archevêque de Paris et le cadavre futur de M. Grégoire." Meanwhile, letters were passing between the Archbishop and Mgr. Grégoire. The Archbishop implored him to be reconciled with the Church. The dying Bishop, who certainly had all his wits about him, replied in a long argumentative epistle that if the Church condemned his teaching he would submit, but that the Church had never done so yet. The civil constitution of the Clergy was condemned by some Bishops, but not by others. Grégoire claimed that his orthodoxy had been recognized by the predecessors of the present Archbishop of Paris.

The Archbishop insisted, but in vain. Grégoire died unreconciled. Thereupon the Archbishop prohibited the use of the Catholic forms of burial. A scandalous scene ensued. The church was forced open by the police, the corpse introduced, and some unknown individual induced to perform the Catholic rites.

Here was a theme for the *Avenir!* What are the rights of the State? Certainly to intervene if public peace is disturbed. But not to regulate the worship, nor to direct the Church's prayers. Cemeteries are under public control, for a cemetery is a place of common burial, irrespective of religion. But all that the State can rightly demand in a cemetery is a little earth to cover up the corpse. But those who are not of the Church's fellowship can have no claim to the Church's rites. There can be no such thing as religious freedom of worship if the State or any other power can force a

Bishop, or a Protestant minister, or a Jewish Rabbi to receive a person irrespective of the principles of their religion. The conduct of the Archbishop of Paris must be judged relatively to the principles of the Communion which he represents. The question is not whether the Archbishop of Paris, and the Catholics who obey him as their chief, are right or wrong in refusing the Sacraments and religious ceremonies in any case. Catholics have the right to be wrong if they wish ; and nobody has the right to compel them to become what he considers reasonable. Every citizen is at liberty to think, and whether his opinions are reasonable or absurd cannot alter the fact of his freedom to think them. Clearly nobody has the right to force the Freemasons to accord funeral honours to a person whom they decline to recognize as a member. And the case is precisely similar with Catholics. It is in the general interests of freedom that corporate opinions should not be violated. The *Avenir* repeatedly insisted that it was not a question of the personal excellence of the deceased, but of his membership in a certain corporation. No doubt the deceased had claimed to be a member of the corporation, but the corporation itself declared that he was not. A man must be classed in death with those to whom he adhered in life.

The School of Lamennais asserted that the Church would never obtain freedom until it was independent of the State. Three stages of the relation between Church and State were distinguished in the *Avenir ;* first the theocratic, in which the Church absorbs the State ; secondly, the Protestant, in which the State absorbs the Church ; and finally, the modern, in which Church and State coexist in independence,

slowly moving from indifference to mutual understanding and reconciliation.

The *Avenir* insisted that in France the relation of the spiritual order to the temporal had only reached the second stage. The Church was under the control of the State. What was the cause? Gallicanism, answered the *Avenir*, was the cause. Gallicanism therefore was the object of the *Avenir's* unrelenting and unmeasured detestation and scorn. The " bastard and degenerate Catholicism of the Gallican " was said to be at the root of all their troubles. In the school of the *Avenir* forms of religion were stated in a proportion sum ; Gallicanism is to Catholicism as Anglicanism to Protestantism. It was bluntly declared that Bossuet had wrought in France more harm to Catholicism than Luther had done. The destruction of Gallicanism, therefore, was one of the avowed aims for which the *Avenir* existed.

This meant an uncompromising Ultramontane crusade. The *Avenir* stood for Papalism of a most advanced description, together with liberalism almost equally advanced. Lamennais called on the clergy to refuse all payment from the State, to throw themselves upon the generosity of the faithful, and, if need be, since the interest of the Church required it, to be poor like their Master, for the Church's sake. He expounded the Ultramontane idea of the Papacy with an aggressive vehemence and tactless disregard to its effect on the Gallican clergy of France, which stands as a singular comment upon his own subsequent repudiation of the same. On the death of the Pope who had befriended and approved him, he wrote that the Church had lost its chief, and Christendom its father. He apostrophized, while the See was still vacant, the

unknown successor already chosen in the secret counsels of the Most High. He offered beforehand a submission without limits and a devotion inexhaustible, to the very authority which, as a matter of fact, he would one day entirely disown. The *Avenir* was the production of young men, of an enthusiastic school of the prophets, under the leadership of a middle-aged master of genius and reputation. The result was that the journal is pervaded by an atmosphere of discipleship and panegyric. It was natural. But it was strong measure to quote in Lamennais' own Review the passage in which a contemporary journal declared that by the incomparable vigour of his eloquence this man was placed at the head of the Church, bearing alone the burden of its advocacy and defence; that he had done more for the Church than all the Popes of the last three centuries; and that if the Conclave proclaimed him Pope they would only be recognizing a long-existing fact.

It is more than probable that Lamennais, who left the management very much in the hands of his school, never saw this production before it appeared; but it is a significant indication of his disciples' disposition.

Lamennais compelled attention. He always did. His fiery logic was irresistible. But he provoked as greatly as he pleased. Rome was naturally well disposed towards this fierce advocate of religious centralization. On the other hand, Ultramontane ideas were repugnant enough to the dignified clergy of France. Nervous of every move by which popular feeling might be roused, the Government several times over retaliated with the weapon of suppression.

No doubt the *Avenir* could have struggled on in

spite of this despotic censorship. But when Pastorals appeared in one diocese after another denouncing the journal and prohibiting its perusal by the faithful, the crisis became acute. It was quite impossible for a religious journal to exist in France in defiance of the ecclesiastical authority. Not that Lamennais' scheme attached much importance to the Bishops. The only authority that in his opinion mattered was that at Rome. To Rome therefore he now resolved to appeal. This dramatic move of the pilgrims of liberty advancing on Rome with the intention of bearing back its approval with France only illustrates the singular limitations of intellectual people. Who that remotely understood the character of Italian diplomacy could imagine that this sensational method of forcing the action of authority could be congenial in the headquarters of Latin Christendom ?

Nevertheless, Lamennais, with his two chief followers Montalembert and Lacordaire, determined to take this course. It was natural for Lamennais to go with confidence. The flattering reception at his previous visit, when he was an honoured guest within the Vatican, and on familiar terms with the chief authority, must have left a deep impression on the impressionable soul of the Breton priest. But Lamennais found everything changed ; and, from his standpoint, changed entirely for the worse. Coldness and caution met him everywhere. The new Pope was a stranger to him and a man of other views.

Gregory XVI. was not likely to appreciate a bold theorist such as Lamennais. Called to succeed Pius VIII. at the age of sixty-six, it has been said of him that in a long obscure monastic career he had acquired rather the virtues of a good religious than the qualities

necessary for administration.[1] His inexperience of practical affairs made him distrustful and afraid. Lamennais' opinion of him was most unfavourable. He is a good, well-meaning man, Lamennais wrote, but a stranger to the world, completely ignorant alike of the conditions of the Church and of society. He weeps and he prays. If things remain as they are another twenty years Catholicism will be dead.

Gregory was not in the least desirous of seeing Lamennais. However, he granted him an audience, but only on the express condition that no reference should be made to the object of their pilgrimage. So the wrathful reformer spent fifteen exasperating minutes in the papal presence while the chief descanted amiably on art and other irrelevant affairs.

Lamennais issued from the Vatican with the painful sense that his reputation in Rome had died with a former Pope.

Not, of course, that he had no friends in the city. There were theologians and even Cardinals who respected his simplicity of aim and high disinterestedness of character. But the policy of the proud Breton found no favour among the diplomatists of the Curia. Nothing was done. Lamennais lived in Rome the life of a recluse, engaging Lacordaire to compose a memoir of their case for presentation to Gregory. Meanwhile, the romantic Montalembert became enamoured of an Italian princess who refused him, whereupon he left Rome in the distractions of unrequited love. Lacordaire's memoir described the state of religion in France as oppressed by Government and hated by the majority of the nation. Practice of religious duties was daily becoming more rare. Gallicanism, which meant

[1] Boutard, ii. 272.

alliance with despotism, had lost its force. Government nominated its own creatures for the episcopate and then interfered with them in the discharge of their spiritual functions. Under these circumstances the only remedy lay in the total separation of the Church from the State. Such separation no principle of theology, no canon of the Church, no apostolic tradition, disallows. Therefore no difficulty need be raised by Catholics. There were, indeed, two sacrifices which must be made : the one political, the other financial. Catholics must recognize that their Religion is not incompatible with freedom, whether of worship, or of teaching, or of the Press ; or with any particular form of government ; and that, in fact, this is the only way to save the Church. Freedom will not be allowed to one kind of worship unless it is allowed to all. Lacordaire pointed the Italian ecclesiastics to the freedom which existed in the United States. This freedom so far from obstructing the Church had proved to be greatly to its advantage. The other sacrifice which must be made to secure separation from the State is the sacrifice of payment of the clergy. This sacrifice was declared under existing circumstances to be a duty.

The memoir gave the Pope Lamennais' version of the facts about the *Avenir*. It was couched in the humblest, most deferential terms. It explained that they had come as pilgrims to the Chair of Truth. It called on the successor of Peter to deign to regard the lowliest of his children. If there was anything in their thoughts discordant with his, they would relinquish it. He was the rule of their doctrines. Never, never would they own any other than his.

Lacordaire's memoir about the *Avenir* was entrusted

to Cardinal Pacca, the distinguished companion of the exile of Pius VII., when Napoleon carried him captive out of Italy. Cardinal Pacca replied some weeks later that the Pope disapproved their course, but that an inquiry into their principles would be undertaken.

Then followed a wearisome suspense. The delay, however necessary, sorely tried Lamennais' patience and became almost unbearable. Lacordaire had the penetration to understand what the silence of Rome implied. He prudently left the city and returned to France. Lamennais lingered, growing more moody and morose, until at length the futility of dawdling in the ante-chambers of Rome forced itself upon his reluctant conviction; and, without his answer, he also left. In his after-reflections he naïvely records that a certain simplicity of character hinders the understanding of many matters, and chiefly of those which concern practical life.

Lamennais' retrospect on Rome was already embittered. Rome, he wrote, is called the country of those who have none. It was certainly the country for no one else. To him it was a city of ruins, choked with the mouldering relics of departed grandeur. One might go to Rome to die, but certainly not to live. It is a city of the dead. It is an impoverished city, even if distinguished names still haunt the corners of its vast and silent palaces. It is a natural instinct with all living creatures to withdraw into solitude when their dissolution is near. Even the famous monogram, "S.P.Q.R.," stands now in Lamennais' fancy for *si peu que rien*. The very churches of Rome are all signs of decadence and corrupted taste. It is a positive relief to see the last of it.

Meantime, behind the apparent apathy was life.

Diplomacy had been extremely energetic. The French Government and the French Episcopate, from very different motives, urged on Rome that the bold journalist should be condemned. To these representations Rome yielded. In the Encyclical *Mirari vos*, Gregory XVI. disowned the principles of the *Avenir*.

Lamennais had appealed to his ultimate authority, and it had decided against him. He had advocated the necessity of despotic centralization of spiritual power, and that very power had now condemned him. What line would the French Tertullian take? Would he yield that unlimited submission which, during the vacancy of the See, he had offered to the unknown representative of supreme authority? It was not in Lamennais' nature to do it. He now realized that ecclesiastical power must have its limits. There is a bound beyond which it has no right to go. He offered a qualified submission. He drew distinctions. He accepted the Encyclical so far as it taught Apostolic tradition. But he claimed that the Christian in the political sphere stands independent of Ecclesiastical Authority.

De Quélen, Archbishop of Paris, certainly did his utmost to reconcile Lamennais with Rome, but his influence was neutralized by the fact that he had instigated the decision. His overtures were quite in vain. The heart of the prophet was enraged. The principle of freedom must be proclaimed, whatever the authority which opposed it, and be the consequences what they may. The Ultramontane was in reaction. When freedom was opposed by the Church, what else could he do but despair? That cause, Lamennais was certain, was the cause of God. And his faith wavered in the Institution which opposed it.

Lamennais had now to experience the sore trial of isolation, as one by one the little school of able men who owned him as their master disappeared. He felt most acutely his abandonment by Lacordaire. He penned the bitterest expressions. Lacordaire was "cold as a night in winter when the wind is in the north." He took pessimistic views of the future of the Church. Reform of the Church from within appeared to him impossible.[1] The authorities, he told Montalembert, "would disown you, injure you, calumniate you. You do not realize what clerical animosity is." Its spirit was illustrated in the Passion of Christ. Its culmination was deicide. Consequently, the only feasible course was to work outside the Church: that is to say, to avoid treating any question from the theological point of view. He warns Montalembert not to go to Italy after publishing a pamphlet criticizing Church affairs. "Don't forget that the men whom you attack are capable of anything."

Lamennais wrote all this under the stress of provocation.

Further trouble came. His enemies determined to ruin his brother's schools, in consequence of the Papal brief against the *Avenir*. Then he himself sustained financial losses. He selected his grave. It was in the depth of solitude. A cross was to be cut in the solid rock. The only thing he cares for now is nature. All that reminds him of mankind makes him ill.

It was in the intensity of this morbid mood that he dashed off his famous *Paroles d'un Croyant*.

The *Paroles d'un Croyant* is a denunciation of tyranny, a manifesto of social democracy addressed to the million. It is thrown into brief, sententious

[1] *Forgues*, p. 52.

utterances, and fiery phrases : extraordinarily forcible, but exaggerated and overdone. Strange allegories are interspersed, weird, theatrical, melodramatic, mixed with the morbid, even the ludicrous, and the weakly sentimental. It is the cry of a wounded visionary : but it is a sharp and arresting cry. Its noble purpose gives it acuteness and strength.

We may take, as a single illustration, the allegory of the bad man, loathed of Heaven, who, nevertheless, was strong ; who hated toil and forced his fellow-men by cruelty to toil for him. Wherefore there were no more brothers upon earth, but only masters and slaves. Then appeared another bad man, worse than he, and said to the people : " You labour six hours a day, and you are paid one coin. Work twelve hours and you will gain two, and it will be better for you and for your families." And the people believed him. He said again, " You only work on half the days of the year. Work every day, and your gain will be doubled." And the people believed him again. But then it came to pass that half of the men who were employed before found no one any longer to employ them. Then the bad man offered them work at half their proper pay. And they accepted it, and blessed him, and said, " he has saved our lives." And so the bad man who deceived the workers amassed far more wealth than the bad man who forced them by cruelty. Now, the name of the first is Tyranny, and the second has no name but Hell.

Lamennais said true things, but he mixed whole classes in indiscriminate denunciation. Like many a reformer, he always lived in extremes. He appeared to think the Papacy could be justly characterized in the single sentence : " Who is this old man who

speaks of justice while he holds a poisoned cup in one hand, and with the other caresses a harlot who calls him Father."

The effect of the *Paroles d'un Croyant* was sensational. Even the very printers were so roused by the fragments read in the office that the publisher took fright, and refused to proceed unless the work appeared without the author's name. Its reception by the public was no less unusual.[1] It appeared first in an expensive form. There was an instant demand for popular editions. People paid so much an hour to hear it read. It was read in public to groups in the gardens in Paris. It was highly commended to the literary world by Saint-Beuve in the *Revue des Deux Mondes.* All France seemed full of it: either for or against. It was translated into several languages. Lamennais' letters about it show an intoxicating joy. But he knew a storm would follow. He professed himself as ignorant as the rest of the world what Rome was going to do. Rome had consulted whether a condemnation would be possible, advisable, useful, safe. The general opinion seemed to favour caution. Then Lacordaire published a quite incompetent attack on Lamennais' philosophic ideas. Lamennais professes ignorance of its contents: but from what he hears it is pretty bad. "I pity that unfortunate young man," he wrote, "but nothing he does surprises me."

Then came the pamphleteers in reply to the *Paroles d'un Croyant.* Their titles may suggest their spirit. *Reponse d'un Chrétien aux Paroles. Paroles d'un Voyant. Paroles d'une Croyante. Paroles d'un Mécréant. Apostasie de M. de Lamennais.*

[1] May, 1834.

The sensitive author was instantly hurt and depressed. He began to write about the Garden of Olives, and the Mystery of the Agony of human nature.

The opinions pronounced upon this celebrated book are almost as sensational as the book itself. According to Lamennais'[1] biographer it was described as the Gospel of Revolt and the Apocalypse of Sedition; a book which the Devil if he appears in the world will carry in his hand; a book which will ever be for Catholics the object of righteous condemnation; but which nevertheless contains some of the most poetic comments on the Gospel ever written.

The *Paroles d'un Croyant* ruined its author's relation to the Church, and made the fortune of the firm which published it. We are told that it drew to them the notice of many distinguished men, and the names of Victor Hugo, Sainte-Beuve, and many others appeared among their publications.[2]

Rome was not long this time in pronouncing its opinion. The Encyclical *Singulari vos* appeared in July, 1834, and condemned the work in severe terms although without mentioning the author. According to Gregory XVI., the *Paroles d'un Croyant* filled the mind with horror. It aimed, by crafty fictions, to destroy the Catholic truth. It broke the bonds of loyalty to princes. It lit the fires of sedition and revolt. It taught contempt for magistrates and violation of the laws. It would establish absolute liberty of opinion by means of force. It assumed the air of one inspired by Heaven. And therefore, in the plenitude of his apostolic power, Gregory pronounced it reproved and condemned, as involving falsity,

[1] See Boutard. [2] *Ibid.*, iii. p. 34.

calumnious, rash, anarchical, contrary to the Word of God, impious, scandalous, misleading.

The problem before Lamennais was: What was the precise value of this Encyclical?[1] According to his biographer, certain theologians in Rome considered that it was invalidated by the circumstances of its production, and therefore possessed no more authority than the personal opinion of Mauro Capellari. But we are by no means told, nor is it in the least degree likely, that this was the general view. And for Lamennais, this evasion was impossible. His Ultramontane idea of Papal Authority precluded such a view. At the same time, limitless submission was equally impossible. He was slain by the theory of Papal Absolutism which, in his earlier years, he had done his very utmost to promote.

From this period Lamennais withdrew himself from all exercise of priestly functions, and from all communion of any kind with the Church. The sequel was tragic. In his earlier period he had been a spiritual adviser of no small influence. His letters to the Baroness Cottu, whom he restored to the Faith, still testify to the depth and power of his belief. In those days he could write to one in doubt: "For six thousand years mankind has believed without comprehending. Why strive against a Faith so consoling and so pure? Why heap up darkness before the one light which makes clear the path of life? Why say, I will not believe if I cannot comprehend what the human race declares to be incomprehensible? Be careful not to cherish such sentiments as these. They are neither Christian nor reasonable."[2]

But now the authority of the collective reason of

[1] *Ibid.*, iii. p. 88. [2] D'Haussonville, p. xxvi.

mankind, which he had made the basis of religious certitude, had lost its power for him. He had identified the collective reason with centralized authority at Rome, and this had failed him ; for it had declared against the freedom of mankind. That was his view. And when Rome failed to endorse his idea of freedom, he not only lost belief in it, but in the whole Religion which it represented. Even his faith in Christ, and in the Divine Fatherhood, seems to have disappeared in the violence of his emotional and mental reaction. His religion seems henceforth reduced to the rudiments of a somewhat indefinable Deism.

With the exception of a few real friends the so-called religious world treated him disgracefully. It pestered and persecuted, defamed and depreciated the man whom it once had honoured as its great apologist. No meanness was too petty to retaliate upon his apostasy. Nor was he a success in the non-religious world. He found himself in uncongenial society, at times in compromising situations, where he could do no good, and yet somehow from which he had neither the prudence nor the tact to extricate himself.

Born to be a man of strife and contention on the earth, as every reformer must, Lamennais' experiences did not tend to soothe his exasperation or restrain his vehemence. His violent journalistic attacks on imperial power roused the suspicions of the State, and his rooms were raided by the police ; happy as ever, he said, in their inspirations. " They have done me the honour," he added, " of one of those visits in which they display so much amenity and grace." Nothing, however, of an incriminating nature could be found. The fact is that Lamennais detested violence in actions as much as he loved it in words.

But he deeply loved it in words. Out he flew again after the visit of the police, into impassioned denunciations of despotic rule. This time Guizot took proceedings against the writer. Lamennais' new pamphlet was considered to be an insult to the King and the legislature. The unfortunate reformer was condemned to a year's imprisonment and a fine of 2000 francs. The trial and the sentence roused great sympathy and increased his popularity. But the year in prison meant oblivion. No popular movement greeted his release. He emerged to find himself already forgotten.

The latest phase of Lamennais' career came with the overthrow of monarchy in the Revolution. He was now elected a representative of the people. Close beside him, a strange proximity, sat, in his white robe, his former disciple, the great Dominican preacher, Lacordaire. Then came the awful days of the massacre, which, amid thousands of innocent lives, sent the Archbishop of Paris to his death on the barricades. Lamennais contemplated with helpless horror the translation of the language of violence into violence of deed. The representative of the people retired into obscurity.

Round Lamennais' death-bed in 1854 raged a struggle between the friends of his earlier and of his later career ; the former attempting to recover him to Catholicism, the latter to retain him in his anti-Catholic mood. However, he died unreconciled to the Church. He was buried in the cemetery of Pére-Lachaise, in a common grave, without any recognition of religion, or remark of any kind ; except that an overseer said, "Leave room to bury an infant there," and then to the bystanders as they lingered, "You can go, gentlemen, it is all over." No emblem of any kind marks the grave.

The Benedictine writer, Lobineau, author of the *Lives of the Saints of Brittany*, himself, like Lamennais, a Breton, tells a story, says d'Haussonville, of a certain religious who was accustomed to add to the Litany of the saints a daily petition, "a furore sanctorum libera me, Domine." From this *furor sanctorum* Lamennais suffered both while living and since dead. He was constantly calumniated in his lifetime; and after his death there was, says d'Haussonville, scarcely a religious writer for half a century who could mention his name without some derogatory epithet. Time, however, has brought into the Roman Catholic world new ideas, and with them a reaction in Lamennais' favour, and a fairer judgment upon his merits. It is remembered now that certain of his papal and social conceptions have been, since his death, specially endorsed by the Roman Church. Moreover, in less partial retrospect, it has come to be better understood that if Lamennais had his faults he had also his excuses. The Pope who understood him best fully discerned the man's emotional and impulsive character. "C'est un homme qu'il faut conduire avec la main dans son cœur." But this penetrating discernment did not guide the successor of Leo XII. As d'Haussonville says, Lamennais was treated with the greatest hardness and indiscretion. His submission may or may not have been complete. But he was continually denounced at Rome, subjected to incessant suspicions. Humiliations were inflicted on him, one after another, which, as the same writer says, were not altogether prompted by zeal for the house of the Lord. There can be very little doubt that if Leo XII. had still governed the Roman Church in the crisis of the *Avenir*, Lamennais would not have been treated as he

actually was by Gregory XVI. Of course, it will naturally be said that this only evades the main issue. You cannot reasonably accept authority only on the condition that it agrees with you. Yet what really happened was that Lamennais' extravagant Ultramontanism was severely tested by the facts of life. The proper moral is the danger of *à priori* and abstract ideas. Lamennais was essentially a theorist with very little historical penetration. He never really knew the facts of Christendom. He illustrates the tremendous strain imposed by an over-centralized despotic authority in religion. Communions which suffer from the opposite extreme may do well to reflect that if it is possible to have too little authority it is also possible to have too much. Conflicting elements induced authority to act on opportunist principles, and the former apologist was thereby driven out.

II

LACORDAIRE

Henri Lacordaire was born among the hills of Burgundy, as the certificate of his birth records, "on the 22nd day of the month of Floréal, in the year 10 of the French Republic," that is to say, on the 13th of May, 1802. He was the youngest son of a medical officer who died when the child was only four. His mother is described by her son as "Christian, courageous, and vigorous." She brought up her children in Spartan simplicity, deeply impressing on their minds the sense of honour which one of Lacordaire's French biographers calls "a feeling more human than ecclesiastical," and which became a conspicuous characteristic in several crises of his priestly career. His master's verdict on him as a schoolboy was curtly given in the suggestive words, "puer ingeniosus sed insignis nebulo." He seems to have combined much sweetness of disposition with fits of rebellious independence.

French schools in the beginning of the nineteenth century were hotbeds of conspicuous irreligion. The imperial college of Dijon successfully undermined Lacordaire's faith. He left college at the age of seventeen with his religion destroyed and his morals impaired.

He then became a student in the Dijon faculty of Law, where he distinguished himself by his literary

and rhetorical gifts. Legal studies and general literature, with a certain amount of intellectual discussion, absorbed his energies, and left but little space for the consideration of religion. Meanwhile as a barrister he at once attracted notice, and those best qualified to judge considered him capable of attaining the front rank of his profession.

But the process of his religious development, long arrested by adverse surroundings, began in this period, as his mind matured. His scepticism was of the vague, indefinite sort, due more to the irreligious atmosphere breathed at college than to any intellectual problems or reasoned doubts. He was under the dissipating influence of the surrounding unbelief. He ceased to ridicule Catholicism, which, however, he made no serious attempt to understand. There were no precise objections obstructing the way to faith. He became conscious that he offered to Religion unreasoning resistance. "I have an extremely religious soul," he writes, "and a very unbelieving mind, but as it is in the nature of the mind to allow itself to be subjugated by the soul, it is probable that some day I shall be a Christian."

He was now twenty years of age. The process of his conversion occupied the greater part of the next two years. He began to read the gospels for himself. He was found on his knees in church, his face in his hands, absorbed in prayer. At last he came to the Christian decision. He allowed six months to elapse before he informed even his mother of the great change. In the cathedral of Paris, hereafter the scene of his wonderful ascendancy as a preacher, he was purified by repentance, absolved, and fortified by the Sacred Eucharistic Gift.

It was characteristic of Lacordaire's strength of purpose that, having won the Faith for himself he was forthwith impelled with the desire to impart it to others. It was impossible for him to do anything by halves. Being a Christian he must go on to become a priest. Obstructions, however, came from a quarter perhaps unexpected. He encountered his mother's resistance. Henri was her favourite son and she had strained the slender resources of the house in her ambition to start him well in the legal profession. She rejoiced to see him a Christian, but resented the sacrifice of his worldly hopes. He could achieve a prosperity as a barrister which would be impossible as a priest. She wrote him letter after letter, doing her utmost to dissuade him from his vocation. But finding his determination proof against all her entreaties, she ultimately yielded a somewhat reluctant consent.

It was the year 1824 when the young barrister, aged twenty-two, offered himself to de Quélen, Archbishop of Paris, as a candidate for the priesthood. Little did the Archbishop realize the mind and characteristics of the candidate who stood before him.

Lacordaire represented an advanced modern type of French thought and character. He was a liberal politician through and through. His sympathies were profoundly democratic. He had no interest in the old regime, and the smallest admiration for monarchy. The popular republican movement and ideals he appreciated and understood. The influence of the State over the Church he regarded as an unqualified disaster. The complete and immediate separation of the Church from the State was in his view one of the most urgent and pressing necessities.

Napoleon's despotic control of the Church in France was doubtless among the causes of Lacordaire's revolt from monarchy. The opening year of the nineteenth century saw the Parisian prefect of police summoning the Abbé Frayssinous before him because the monk had neglected the police order to speak about military conscription, the glory of Napoleon, and the crises of France, in the course of his sermons on the existence of God. The minister of State for public worship gave instructions to all the Bishops and clergy of France bidding them commend military conscription in their sermons: an order to which they readily complied.

Napoleon went much further than this. He revised the Catechism in the interests of monarchy.

Lacordaire entered the Seminary of Saint Sulpice, or rather the house at Issy under Sulpician direction, in 1824. The contrast between the outer world and the Seminary was often felt to be severe. But for the young barrister it was peculiarly difficult. He passed direct, with no preparation, from the ordinary social surroundings of the courts of law into the grave and severely regulated life of a Sulpician institution. And he was not easily reconciled to the change. Confident, vivacious, argumentative, disputatious, he had his own opinions and he asserted them. He threw down challenges in the professor's lecture-room. If the professor's argument failed to convince him, he criticized his lectures openly. He was still the barrister with a case to defend. He was at times more than a match for his elders. At times the students were evidently more impressed by the pupil than they were by the professor. As witnesses of these unwonted scenes they were at once amused and amazed. These viola-

tions of the orthodox proprieties of the Seminary disconcerted the authorities and gave decided offence. They not unnaturally felt grave misgivings as to Lacordaire's vocation. He certainly did not fit in with the ordinary standard of Sulpician excellence. He was transferred from Issy to Saint Sulpice, but the same distrust continued. Two years and a half elapsed, and even his ordination to the subdiaconate was still postponed.

The independent young Seminarist brought matters to a crisis by a movement which, if he fully realized it, was singularly astute. He asked Archbishop de Quélen's permission to join the order of the Jesuits. He could not possibly have made a wiser overture to secure his aim. For the Jesuits had realized his abilities and were perfectly ready to receive him ; whereas the Archbishop, being a Gallican, had no love for an order which was essentially ultramontane and took its directions, independently of Episcopal authority, immediately from Rome. The consequence was that the Archbishop gave a hint to the superiors of Saint Sulpice, and in 1827 he himself ordained Lacordaire to the priesthood in his own private chapel.

Having, however, frustrated the Jesuits and secured Lacordaire as a priest for the diocese of Paris, the Archbishop did not in the least know what to do with him. De Quélen sent him as chaplain to teach the Catechism at a girls' school, where the good nuns reproached him for dealing too much in metaphysics.

The real difficulty lay in Lacordaire's social and political opinions. He was essentially liberal and democratic, while the higher clergy of the time were thoroughly conservative and monarchical. The

Bishops of the old regime who had been exiled during Napoleon's rule, and had refused to abdicate at the Pope's request, returned to France at the restoration of the Bourbon line. They attempted to reinstate all things as they were before that dynasty fell. They held that everything must be cancelled which was perpetrated in the absence of the legitimate king. The Napoleonic era was a mere irregular interlude in the royal succession. These Bishops ignored the whole popular liberal and republican movement of their day. They belonged wholly in spirit to the older period, and were completely out of sympathy with the tendencies dominant around them. In their opinion the cause of Christianity was bound up with the Bourbon dynasty, "and a priest who was not under the Bourbon flag seemed an enigma to the more moderate and a sort of traitor to the more ardent." [1]

Now Lacordaire made no secret of his social principles. "I remained a Liberal," he said, "when I became a Catholic, and I had not been able to hide all that separated me in this respect from the clergy and Catholics of my time. I felt myself alone in these convictions, or at least I met no mind that shared them." [2]

His attitude was accurately expressed in the celebrated sentence uttered in later years: "I die a penitent Catholic and an impenitent Liberal." And this attitude created distrust and suspicion among the authorities of the Catholic world in France.

Lacordaire felt himself mistrusted. He grew discouraged. He wrote in terms of deep depression: "I am weary of thinking and speaking. I am like the theological Faculty of the University of Paris; I have

[1] D'Haussonville, *Lacordaire*. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

hung up my harp on the willows of the Sorbonne." He wrote as if he was quite alone. This was certainly a mere exaggeration. But the opposition to his social theories was so strong in high places that he despaired of finding scope for his free development anywhere in France. The old aristocratic veneration for a monarchy which patronized the Church and hindered it roused the vehement resentment of his strongly enthusiastic democratic belief. It seemed to him only possible to find a sphere of action in harmony with his convictions in some land where Church and State were disconnected, where the Church could work in freedom unimpeded by the politician. Such an ideal sphere it seemed to him America presented. Hither therefore he was resolving to go. At this crisis the Bishop of New York offered him the position of Vicar-General and Superior of the Seminary. What his career would have been if this offer, in some respects congenial, had been accepted, it is not easy to surmise.

It was his encounter with Lamennais which retained Lacordaire in France. Lamennais was then at the height of his reputation and influence. As d'Haussonville says, although he held no rank or dignity in the Church, yet he "exerted more influence and possessed more authority over the younger clergy than did bishops and cardinals. His contemporaries were more attentive to his words than to those which came from the pulpits; and in the religious domain, he had taken possession of their imagination as well as of their thought." [1]

Lamennais, the embodiment of political liberalism within the Roman Church, with his maturity of

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

thought and brilliancy of expression, with the extraordinary ascendancy which he had achieved over the intelligent young men of France, very naturally captivated the ardent young priest who, although with some discrimination, saw in him the fulfilment of many of his own aspirations. And when Lamennais propounded his scheme for the creation of a new journal of liberal and social ideas, Lacordaire was immediately won, and threw aside all thoughts of exile in New York.

Then came the Revolution of July, 1830, and the beginning of the eighteen years' reign of Louis Philippe. The first number of Lamennais' Review, the *Avenir*, appeared three months after the Revolution (16 Oct., 1830), opened by Lamennais himself with an article on the state of affairs in France. The *Avenir* took as its fundamental principle the demand for social and religious freedom. This was the cause which brought Lacordaire into friendship with Montalembert.

The story of Lacordaire's defiance of the State monopoly of Education, how he opened a school in order to claim liberty of teaching, and how he and Montalembert pleaded their case before the House of Paris, is told in the account of Montalembert's career.[1]

The career of the *Avenir* was meteoric in brilliancy and brevity. Its vigorous independence and splendid enthusiasm captured the younger clergy of France. It became their oracle. Nor was its influence lessened when Lamennais and Lacordaire were cited to appear before the Court of Assizes for having committed the double misdemeanour of inciting to contempt of the Government, and to disobedience of the Law. Lacordaire's speech enumerating some of the grievances of the Catholic Church was followed by his acquittal and

[1] See p. 77.

by a popular enthusiasm in which a weaker man would have been carried away.

But neither the popularity of the *Avenir* with the younger clergy and with Catholic laity of the more modern type, nor its acquittal in the judgment of the Courts, could secure it from the strong disapprobation and active opposition of Catholics of the older school. The Bishops condemned it almost unanimously in their Pastorals and forbade its circulation.

Then Lamennais determined on appeal to Rome. The story of the three pilgrims of liberty, Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert, must be told elsewhere. It belongs more largely to the lives of the other two than to that of Lacordaire. What appears most conspicuously in it is Lamennais' amazing indiscretion, and his obstinate and perverse refusal to see the obvious meaning of the Pope's aloofness. Lacordaire, with incomparably greater insight, realized the uselessness of waiting in Rome till Rome replied, of attempting to hasten the possibility and designedly deliberate movements of the imperturbable centre of Latin Churchdom. Lacordaire himself withdrew, followed after a wasted interval by Lamennais, who most reluctantly was forced to see that the younger man was right. Then came the curious scene at the farewell dinner to Lamennais at Munich, when the Nuncio sent him a letter enclosing a copy of the Papal condemnation of the *Avenir*.

Then came the melancholy return to France. Back in Lamennais' country house the master fell a victim to profound depression and despair. Lacordaire compared it with the melancholy that fell on Saul, only adding that none of them possessed the harp of David to dispel the fitful invasion of the evil spirit. Deplor-

able outbursts of irritable temper ensued when the elder man treated the younger with outrageous bitterness and contempt. The hour of their separation had come. Lamennais was for open severance from the Church. Lacordaire was determined that nothing should lead him into schism. After one of Lamennais' inexcusable outbursts of ill feeling, Lacordaire left the house abruptly never to return, leaving behind him a note to explain his reasons. He had lived there at Lamennais' expense. Community of life had become impossible through diversity of opinion on the fundamental duty of a Catholic.

So terminated, after two and a half years, his connection with Lamennais. He returned almost penniless to Paris. The Archbishop gladly received him and gave him his chaplaincy again. But his temporary association with Lamennais haunted the whole of his career, and gave a constant plausibility to the opposition of his enemies. He felt driven to write in his own defence. He published what he considered to be a refutation of Lamennais' philosophy.

Lacordaire, while severely criticizing Lamennais, paid his tribute to the extraordinary effect which the master's apologetic work produced. When the first volume of the Essay on Indifference appeared, Catholic enthusiasm knew no bounds. In a single day Lamennais found himself invested with an authority which had no parallel since Bossuet.[1] For this first volume had marshalled all the ancient arguments for the insufficiency of reason and the necessity of faith. Men waited eagerly for the sequel. Having established the necessity of faith, where was the authority to direct the human mind? After two years' suspense the second

[1] Lacordaire, *Works*, vii. p. 37.

volume appeared. Nothing could exceed the surprise which this second instalment created. For here it was announced that the basis of all certainty was the *sensus communis* of the human race.[1]

The infallible authority of mankind; that was the foundation of the new apologetic. Could anything be more startling and disconcerting to the Catholic mind? The Church had always recognized the high value of the common sense of mankind; but there was only one infallible authority, and that was the Church itself. On what ground did Lamennais rest his doctrine of the infallibility of the human race? It surely needs some proof. What can the demonstration be? Lamennais affirmed that the authority of the human race must be admitted without demonstrations. For every proof presupposes a truth already certain, and consequently the infallibility of the reason which affirms it. But in that case, replied Lacordaire, why not admit the infallibility of the Church without proof just as much as the infallibility of the human race? The secret of the success of Lamennais' first volume was its admirable demonstration of the necessity of authority. The cause of the failure of the second was its ascription of that infallible authority to mankind. Lamennais propounded the doctrine that unless human reason is infallible there is no certainty possible and we are flung back into universal doubt. Whether Lacordaire thoroughly understood Lamennais is another matter; but he accused his theory of being more entirely Protestant than any previous system. For he replaced the authority of the silent, but Infallible Book, by the authority of the human race, which is still less possible to ascertain;

[1] p. 42.

since it has no organ for the expression of that authority, and can form no judgment on controversial disputes.

And further, Lamennais is compelled to maintain that the authority of the Church is greater than that of the human race. But how can any authority be greater than one which is infallible? If the authority of the human race is infallible, what is to prevent its being invoked against the authority of the Church? Are then two conflicting authorities both infallible?

There was in Lacordaire's criticism, style and eloquence and beauty of expression, fervour, and faith. But it cannot be said that he was in any degree a match for the genius of Lamennais. Neither the learning nor the logic of Lamennais was possessed by the great preacher. It was useless for Lacordaire to say that he visited Rome, and there at the tombs of the Apostles he came to understand. He could tell neither the day nor the hour. But he saw in Rome what he had not previously seen, and left the city free and victorious. This mystical utterance was no reply to the logical dilemma of Lamennais. But what it all meant was this: that for Lamennais Religion was almost entirely speculative, while for Lacordaire it was also experimental. Lamennais was the philosopher but he was not the religious. Lacordaire was on true lines when he said that the human intellect is not healed by demonstrations. The philosophic demonstration of the existence of God is not religion. Lamennais lived too much in the region of abstract theory, too little in that of personal devotion.

Lacordaire allowed himself to describe in terms of satire how a philosophy issued from the eloquent pen

of a distinguished writer. It attracted the wonder and admiration of the world, which pronounced its author the only person capable of saving the Church if indeed the Church was capable of being saved. But the Church to the world's amazement did not adopt this view. The world accused the Church of ingratitude, and prophesied the ruin of an institution incompetent to discern its own defenders. That is the way, exclaimed Lacordaire, that men speak of the City of God, and that is the way it refutes the vain reasonings of men.[1] To Lacordaire's contemplation the Church was never more divine than when it refused to do what the world expects.

Whatever effect such pictures might produce within the circle of the already convinced, their influence as a reply to Lamennais was unfortunate. It was felt, and reasonably felt, within the Church itself, that for a disciple to write of his former master in terms like these was a defect of refinement and of sympathy.

Lacordaire's reply to Lamennais was an inferior piece of work. His powers lay in another direction than philosophic analysis. He was only at the beginning of his development. The critics compared the effort to a child who strikes his nurse, and the essay failed to achieve the effect that was intended.

It was at this period that Montalembert introduced Lacordaire to the gifted Russian convert, Madame Swetchine, whose wise counsel and experience exerted so beneficial an influence on the priest's career.

It was at this period (1834) that Lacordaire began the work for which the whole bent of his genius designed him. His first efforts as a preacher were in the chapel of the Collège Stanislas. Here from the very

[1] p. 155.

beginning he drew together many of the most distinguished men of the day. It says much for a young preacher's first sermons that they attracted the attention of such masters of literature as Chateaubriand, Lamartine, and Victor Hugo. The sermons were originally intended for the pupils of the school; but visitors encroached upon the space until the pupils were almost excluded.

But if the preacher's unconventionality and the modernness of his social ideas attracted they also roused opposition. The strenuous resistance which beset Lacordaire's teaching to the bitter end showed itself from the very first. It is even extraordinary to witness the fierceness of the opposition. He was already denounced to his Archbishop, to Rome, and to the Government of France. The Archbishop at first supported him. Rome replied that if the Archbishop was satisfied it had nothing to say. But the opposition grew vehement, and de Quélen grew timid. The conferences had only lasted three months. But they were ended through de Quélen's timidity.

The Archbishop felt that some alternative would have to be supplied. So he provided a safer series of conferences with preachers of less modern qualities at Notre Dame. But the men of Paris refused to attend them. They wanted Lacordaire. Ozanam, distinguished for his philanthropic lectures, and his learning, the moving spirit in a great Catholic organization of young men, implored the Archbishop to give them Lacordaire at Notre Dame. After much vacillation de Quélen mustered up his courage and, not without misgivings, entrusted his Cathedral pulpit to Lacordaire (1835).

The result was extraordinary. Some six thousand

men, it is said, assembled in the nave of Notre Dame. It was a vast gathering of the outer world ; young men, students in all branches of modern life, many of them wholly alien from Catholic religion. Sermons of the conventional type, presupposing Catholic belief and practice to a large extent, were clearly out of the question for such a gathering. And Lacordaire faced them as a priest indeed, but a priest keenly alive to their ideals, and deeply sympathetic with modern movements. He knew by the instinct of his genius what would appeal to them, and what would draw them towards Catholicity. He touched on the common religious needs of human nature, and showed how Christianity fulfils them. It is perfectly true that his sermons, as de Broglie said, were bold generalizations, more calculated to open out great vistas than susceptible of rigorous proof. Proofs in the logical sense assuredly they were not. But they were lofty and splendid sketches of high ideas, full of modern allusion and suggestive of their time, full at once of submission to Catholic principle and of independence, love of freedom, and originality. There was certainly nothing sensational about the subject chosen. He preached about the Church, the necessity of a teaching Church, the Church's constitution, its moral and infallible authority, of the establishment on earth of a Chief of the Church. No one would get from these titles the least idea of the modernness of their contents. But when the preacher came to his sixth conference, on the evolution of the Church with the temporal order, then indeed he entered on a burning question which, under the existing circumstances of the Church in France, would naturally keep his hearers very much alert. He reminded them in a very fine address that the entrance

of the Church into the world had deprived the Empire of its pontifical functions, and of its control over religious thought. The power of the Church was derived not from Cæsar but from Christ. Its function was in the sphere of truth and grace and virtue. If conflicts arose between Church and State the decision could not be by force as between Empires of the world. For the Church is founded solely on divine grace and persuasion. The strength of the Church is moral, and its defence is martyrdom. It lies in the power of the State to misuse its force against the Church. But history is full of proofs of the force of conscientious sacrifice. What could Pius VII. do against Napoleon? And yet the simple conscientious unarmed resistance of the priest vanquished the master of the legions.

The Church has received its rights from God, and their exercise is beneficial to the State itself. Opposition comes from the spirit of domination and from the spirit of licence. Both these attack the Church. But if they agree in hatred of the Church their mutual hatred is stronger still, and through their mutual hatred, in the irony of Divine justice, the Church is preserved from either.

The conferences of Lacordaire began a great revival among the younger men of Paris. But they also provoked the strongest opposition. To a reader of the twentieth century the violence of this opposition may seem a thing inscrutable. But the older clergy were scandalized by these unwonted ways. They complained of the preacher's theological inaccuracies. He was far too modern for the mediævalist, and far too ultramontane for the Gallican. He neglected the Schoolmen. He ignored Bellarmine. He showed no

deference to, possibly no knowledge of, the voluminous Suarez.

In all these criticisms there was much truth, but far more party spirit. Everything depended on the attitude of the Archbishop. The authority of the French Episcopate at that time was despotic, absolute. And in the hands of the much vacillating de Quélen it became a source of peril to the individual priest. De Quélen had been the young priest's patron, was well aware of his high abilities, and shared to some degree in the credit of his successes. But, with all his personal admiration for Lacordaire, the Archbishop could not endure his political ideas nor his ultramontane proclivities. Nor had he the force of character to resist the accumulating torrent of conservative opposition to the modern type.

Lacordaire was neither by nature nor by training disposed toward the centralized despotism of the Ultramontane. The traditions of Saint Sulpice in his student days were not at all of that character, but rather of a moderate Gallicanism. But the fact is that the despotic rule of the French Episcopate tended constantly to drive their clergy Romeward in order to find a power capable of neutralizing or modifying the exceeding authoritativeness of their Diocesan. De Quélen weakly yielded Lacordaire to the clamour of his opponents, and brought the conferences to an end in 1836, to the dismay of the young men of Paris and the joy of the clergy of the old regime. But his action had an unexpected consequence. For Lacordaire took refuge in Rome. There was nothing else for him to do. He was forced to secure himself with the Pope against his critics in France. Gregory XVI., who knew de

Quélen's tendencies and did not love him, received the great preacher with cordiality. Lacordaire volunteered to be silent or to write, exactly as the Pope preferred. Gregory replied that he required nothing from him officailly ; but at the same time expressed a willingness to receive whatever Lacordaire's spontaneous zeal should suggest in defence of the Holy See.

Here then was a pathway opened for the vindication of his character and principles. Here also was a subject suggested. And the subtlety of the suggestion lay in the fact that if he wrote on the papal claims he would secure the approval of the Pope, while indirectly rebuking the Gallicanism of his own Archbishop. These were the circumstances under which Lacordaire wrote his famous letter on the Holy See, addressed to the young men who had attended his conferences in Paris.

This project was most unwelcome to de Quélen. The very last thing that he wanted was an ultramontane pronouncement from the popular preacher of the day circulated throughout his own Arch-diocese, in contradiction to his own belief. He did his utmost to divert Lacordaire from his intention. He wrote deprecating any movement at all ; laid stress on the necessity of prudence, on the duty of letting sleeping dogs lie. Especially on the opinions called Gallican there was need for peculiar caution, to avoid stirring in France bad blood and endless disputations.

But it was hardly in human nature that the man whom the Archbishop had sacrificed to party spirit should submit to his admonitions and diplomatic advice. The book appeared. It was approved in Rome and disapproved in Paris. Lacordaire was

supported by the Chief over all the Bishops, while from his own Bishop in particular he was more than ever estranged.

Both the priest and the Archbishop were very sore at heart. Lacordaire wrote indignant letters over the Archbishop's profound mistrust of him. He refused to return to Paris, or to trust himself to a support so weak and vacillating. Certainly he did not measure his words. He said that he found in Rome a security and a freedom from intrigues which he was unable to find in Paris.

All this experience tended in no small degree to advance the preacher from the ecclesiastical theories of the Gallican to those of the Ultramontane.

But, after all, Rome was not Paris, and the French priest was yearning for his native land. Yet return he cannot, since the Archbishop will not support him better against opposition. There were two parties among the clergy there in France: one held to the ancient maxims and methods of the Church of France; the other believed that a new era had arrived. Lacordaire belonged to the new. Hence the opposition of all Gallicans; the Archbishop included. Lacordaire feels that he must keep away from France; write some solid work; have a long period of peace. "God has His reasons for exiling me from Paris."

Madame Swetchine offered him wise counsel. She entreats him to allow himself more time before replying to the authorities. A few hours will allow his impulses to be corrected by his reflections. She warns him with a motherly interest against the hastiness of his character.

Lacordaire recognized the wisdom of her counsel. He admitted that he ought to keep in the Archbishop's

good graces. But Mgr. de Quélen represents the *ancienne Église de France.* How then can he accept a priest who believes in new ideas? Do you imagine, he asks, that if I were ambitious, I should not know the proper course to pursue? I should only have to say two words. But I shall never say them. At this moment I forsake my friends, my country, my vocation itself, simply to save my conscience, and not to yield myself to ideas which I believe to be disastrous. Any one can see what offends the Archbishop in my writings. If I were conformed to his ideas, there is nothing to which I might not attain. Instead of that, I am banished, and uncertain of my career and my reputation, as long as I may live."[1]

Meanwhile the Jesuit preacher Ravignan was appointed to continue the conferences in Paris. But other French dioceses applied to Lacordaire. He accepted an offer to preach at Metz. This offended de Quélen still more. The conferences at Metz were followed with similar results to those of Paris: strong approval and equally strong opposition.

Once more he returned to Rome thoroughly depressed. Here he met the Abbé Guéranger working for the re-establishment of the Benedictine Order in France. The idea of restoring another order dawned on Lacordaire. The Archbishop of Paris had distinctly told him that he could offer him nothing but parochial work. And Lacordaire was one of those clergy who do not possess a parochial mind. His mission was to teach.

The order of Dominicans would certainly satisfy him in this respect in the stress it laid on the office of the preacher. But if Lacordaire felt no shrinking

[1] *Correspondence of Lacordaire, and M. Swetchine*, p. 126.

when he sought the office of priest, he recoiled with alarm from the prospect of submission to the directions of a superior. Born in an age which knew not how to obey, independence had been his principal ideal. How could he with his love of liberty transform himself into a docile instrument ruled by the orders of other men? And yet circumstances required this sacrifice. Only by that sacrifice could he acquire the right of a home in France and the sphere for his true vocation. He resolved to enter with some religious order into France.

But what religious order should it be? His energy and independent force of character showed themselves in his reply. Either he would join the Jesuits or the Dominicans. But certainly not the Jesuits because they were established in France already, and he would not co-operate in an order already there. He would undertake the greater enterprise of reintroducing an order which France did not now possess. It was a splendid enthusiasm with a consciousness of power.

But when he told the project in strictest confidence to his friends he met a chilling reception. They told him that the Jesuits were sufficient for modern needs. There was no room in France for another order at all; least of all for the Dominicans, who represented to their modern minds an obsolete mediævalism, hopelessly implicated in the appalling memories of the Inquisition.

They strongly recommended Lacordaire, if he must embrace Monasticism at all, as to the prudence and congeniality of which they evidently had grave misgivings, to show himself more modern and independent by starting a new religious order of his own.

It was a high tribute of admiration to give him

such advice; but he wisely held himself within more modest limits. He went into retreat at Solesmes; and there, under Guéranger's influence, came to the decision that the Order of S. Dominic was his vocation.

He then returned to Paris and confided his scheme to the Archbishop. He could hardly have expected to gain de Quélen's approval. The creation of an extra-diocesan authority within his diocese, and directed from Rome, was certain to increase the papal influence. To a Gallican such a project was bitterness. De Quélen accordingly wrote privately to Rome informing the Pope that if Lacordaire's scheme were allowed, the order would become a citadel of refuge for the school of Lamennais. No more telling and damaging objection could have been propounded. But Rome saw through it. And Lacordaire's plan was sanctioned.

De Quélen was now compelled to withdraw his opposition to the re-establishment of the Dominicans in France. The Pope had approved, and the Archbishop could not openly oppose him. De Quélen did not live to see the issue. He died with martyr-like dignity a victim of the Commune in 1839.

De Quélen's successor was Mgr. Affre. So far as Lacordaire was concerned Affre was an improvement on de Quélen. But Affre also was a Gallican. He also objected to the presence of religious orders in his diocese which were beyond his episcopal control. But he invited Lacordaire to preach at Notre-Dame.

It was now seven years since Lacordaire's brilliant inauguration of the conferences and their abrupt conclusion. Ravignan had been in possession of the Lenten course at Notre-Dame for all those years.

But the Advent course was open, and it was this that Lacordaire undertook.

A new obstacle, however, arose. King Louis Philippe interfered. Louis Philippe had no sympathy with the Dominican either in his religious aims or in his social ideals. Nor was personal religion nor interest in Catholicism among the royal distinctions. Louis summoned the Archbishop and insisted that Lacordaire must not be allowed to preach. Mgr. Affre, who had his reasons for resentment towards Louis Philippe for his flippancy and indifference to Catholic concerns, replied with firmness that he could not refuse Lacordaire without dishonouring himself in the eyes of Paris and of all France. Then, said Louis threateningly, if any disturbance occurs, understand that you will not have a soldier to protect you.

When the news of this interview became public property it caused an immense sensation.

Lacordaire's return to Notre-Dame was now not only the return of a great popular apologist to the scene of his labours from which party spirit had successfully shut him out: it became a critical incident in the struggle for religious and social liberty. The question was whether the strong aversion of masses of men towards the religious orders, claiming for themselves a power which they refused to the Church, while a timorous and arbitrary Government acted without principle, according to the popular passions of the hour, could be overcome by the personal force and ascendancy of this singularly gifted and eloquent preacher of Notre-Dame. Then the Dominican dress created in Paris a vestiarian controversy. The police threatened to interfere if Lacordaire appeared in his Dominican robe. Even his best friends grew

frightened, and advised concessions. Madame Swetchine suggested that if he won the pulpit the outward emblem of his order was immaterial. But the independent spirit of Lacordaire was thoroughly roused. He refused absolutely to make any concession. There was only one authority to which he could submit. The Archbishop knew it, and took advantage. Affre wrote to the General of the Dominicans in Rome, and Lacordaire was forced into submission.[1]

So the conferences of Paris, broken off in 1835, were now resumed in 1843, and continued in 1844, 1845, and 1846. Then resumed again in 1848, 1849, 1850, and concluded in 1851. Seventy-three sermons in all. The most celebrated are the course for 1846 on Jesus Christ, and for 1848 on God.

Lacordaire's conferences of 1846 on Jesus Christ are certainly among the most masterly of his instructions. Particularly beautiful is the appeal to Christ for His aid in describing Him to the hearers.[2]

The conference on the Inner Life of Jesus Christ describes what a later period called His self-consciousness of His Divinity, in which the preacher points out that the claim, unless true, would be extravagantly useless, the apotheosis of self could only increase His difficulties, particularly on Jewish soil, where the one explicit dogma was the unity of God. Lacordaire proceeded to discuss whether Jesus Christ was sincere. This he considers to be demonstrated by His intellectual sublimity, His purity of heart, and His strength of will. Then he considered the various attitudes of men toward Christ at successive stages of their life,

[1] The crown 8vo ed. of 1872, p. 255, makes de Quélen still Archbishop of Paris. But the library ed. of 1872, p. 263, correctly says it was Mgr. Affre.

[2] p. 6.

concluding with the testimony of Napoleon that Jesus Christ was more than man.

The next conference, on the public power of Jesus Christ, is a discussion of His miracles, on the line that if He spoke as being Divine, there is no wonder that He acted as Divine.

Then followed a conference on the Establishment of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ. It is a rule over the intellect and a rule of love over the heart, and an adoration—which means a rule over the will.

Then the preacher, in another conference on the perpetuity of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, went on to show how Christ had conquered the dissolving power of time. Treating of the state of Christianity in modern life, Lacordaire dealt with England, France, and Germany.[1] In the first he pictured with glowing hope the Oxford Movement. The ancient walls of Oxford had heard the most distinguished doctors of Anglicanism speak of Jesus Christ as the primitive Church spoke of Him. In the second, he could not find in France the same fulness of hope for a return to faith. Yet Jesus Christ had His witnesses, His preachers, His missionaries. In the third, Lacordaire saw the source of the war against Jesus Christ in Germany.

The fifth conference on the Pre-existence of Jesus Christ is in reality an outline of the position of the Jews as preparation for the laws of Christ. Religiously considered, they were the most important phenomenon before Christ.[2] Their social uniqueness he analysed as legislative, literary, territorial, and historical. He drew a very striking picture of their disinherited state, without a territory and without a king, seventeen centuries without a temple,

[1] p. 110. [2] p. 121.

and yet resisting every effort at their destruction.[1] Their religious pre-eminence he illustrated in the Messianic idea. Then he concluded with a very fine appeal to the grandeur of the historic antecedents and consequents of Jesus Christ, the Jewish people, and the Catholic Church.[2]

Three more conferences on the attempt of Rationalism, to deny the historic reality of the life of Christ, to convert it into mythology, and to explain it, completed the series.

The details of Lacordaire's enterprise, how he re-established the Order of Dominicans in one diocese after another in France, can be read in the pages of Foisset and Chocane. Suffice it to say that he gathered round him a group of religious spirits filled by a zeal and ardour not unlike his own.

The conferences of 1848, on God, are all the more remarkable when the state of the outer world in France is remembered. It was the year of the Revolution which overthrew the monarchy, and terminated the eighteen years' reign of Louis Philippe.

In the June of 1848 Mgr. Affre met his death on the barricades. Sibour, the new Archbishop, was in full sympathy with Lacordaire, inviting him to continue his conferences at Notre-Dame, and proposing to establish the Dominican-Order in Paris.

But once again Lacordaire's opponents made their influence felt. They complained to Pius IX. (elected in 1846) of the preacher's liberal and revolutionary tendencies. It was a formidable accusation before the policy then dominating Rome. Pius was impressed; and Lacordaire was required to disown certain opinions attributed to him. Lacordaire was deeply hurt by

[1] pp. 132–3. [2] p. 146.

these evidences of distrust. He told Archbishop Sibour that it was impossible to continue his ministry amid systematic misrepresentation. Then he went to Rome. He wrote a letter to Pius IX., full of filial affection and distress, complaining that for twenty years he had publicly served the cause of our Lord, and had been called by three successive Archbishops of Paris, men of very different characters and opinions, to give instruction in their cathedral. He added some impulsive things in this letter. But it was well received. He was appointed Provincial of his Order for the next four years in France. Nevertheless he was required to write a statement of his faith on the coercive power of the Church, on the origin of sovereignty, and on the temporal power of the Pope.

On all these points Lacordaire said what was required of him.

In spite of all these overtures and compliances he was not to continue much longer with the conferences at Paris.

In 1851 came the *coup d'état.* Louis Napoleon acquired the supreme power. The President of the Republic made himself a military dictator.

The attitude of the Church toward these political revulsions was difficult. For Lacordaire, with his passion for freedom, and intense hatred of anything despotic, Napoleon's grasp of power was intolerable. Subservient he would not be; outspoken he could not be without risking suppression from his ecclesiastical superiors. Abp. Sibour pressed him to resume his preaching at Notre-Dame. But the preacher felt that his reappearance there could only be the cause of division between the advocates of the past and those of the present regime. He loathed the new despotism,

and would infallibly have made his detestation plain. He saw with profound regret his friend Montalembert advised by Rome to retain his political influence by overtures to the new head of the Empire.

"I understood," he wrote, "that in my thought, in my language, in my past, I myself was also a liberty, and that it was my part to disappear like other liberties. I thought that I could not preach . . . without exposing the pulpit of Notre-Dame to the risk of becoming a dangerous meeting-place for the friends and the enemies of the new power. The oppression of the time would have been an increasing inducement for me to make some attacks upon despotism, and these would have been made out to be greater than I intended them. I have preferred to be silent: I have found that silence is prudent and dignified, and, in its own way, is a form of mourning for our vanished liberties."[1]

Count d'Haussonville adds to this the significant comment that "it was the misfortune of the Empire, and it suffered the penalty for this until its end, that it had thus closed the mouths of the men who had most generosity of character and independence of spirit."[2] It may be questioned whether it was not also the misfortune of the Church.

Few passages in Lacordaire are better known than his farewell to Notre-Dame. Here is Count d'Haussonville's description:[3]

"On March 9, 1851, he had begun a Lenten Course of Sermons at Notre-Dame before a congregation more eager than ever to listen to his oratory. Nothing could have led to the anticipation that this course was to be

[1] *Lacordaire*, by d'Haussonville, p. 179.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 180. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 175.

the last he would preach, and yet, in the closing sermon, he could not prevent himself from speaking to his hearers as if he were addressing them his farewell. 'I have reached,' he said to them, 'that middle stage in life's journey in which a man strips off his youth and descends along a rapid incline to helplessness and oblivion. I ask no better, since this is the fate which a just Providence assigns to us; but at least, at this parting of the ways, where I can yet once more behold the times that are almost ended, you will not grudge me the pleasure of throwing one glance backward, of calling to mind with you, who were my companions on the road, some of the memories which make this cathedral and yourselves so dear to me.' He then addressed a magnificent invocation to those vaults of Notre-Dame, under whose shadow the greatest events of his life had taken place. It was there, where his soul had opened again to the light, that pardon had descended on his faults, and that he had received God for the second time. It was there that, after long wanderings, he had found the secret of his predestination in that pulpit, which for fifteen years had been surrounded by respect and by honour.[1] It was there that, on his return from voluntary exile,[2] he had brought back the religious habit, and obtained for it the triumph of unanimous respect. It was there, lastly, that all the affections which consoled his life had been born, and that, as a lonely man, unknown to the great, removed from parties, aloof from the places where crowds assemble and connections are formed, he had met the souls that loved him. And in a last outburst he exclaimed: 'And you, gentlemen, already a numerous generation, in whom I have perhaps sown

[1] p. 175. [2] p. 176.

the seeds of some truths and some virtues, I shall remain united with you in the future as I have been in the past; but if the day comes when my strength proves too weak for my will, if you should come to despise what will then be left of a voice that once was dear to you, know that you will never be ungrateful, for nothing henceforth can prevent you from having been the glory of my life, and the crown of my eternity.' And then, leaving his hearers under the emotion of these unexpected words, he slowly descended the steps of the pulpit of Notre-Dame which he was never to mount again."[1]

Lacordaire's farewell to Notre-Dame was not quite the end of his prophetic career. He gave for a while a course of conferences at Toulouse. But his greatest work as a preacher was already a thing of the past. A sphere for his energies was found for him elsewhere. He was appointed to the headship of a school.[2] He felt no particular inclination for this work. The Old Royal Military School of Sorèze, a French Eton as Matthew Arnold called it, was in financial difficulties and a feeble state. Lacordaire left the decision altogether to the General of his Order. The decision was that he ought to undertake it. Lacordaire's reflection in acquiescing was, "Je me suicide, mais c'est Dieu qui le veut."[3]

Here then, as the principal at Sorèze, Lacordaire's last years of energy were spent.

From his home in the school at Sorèze the great Dominican watched in silent keenness the affairs of the wider world. The struggle of the Italian States for nationality and independence of the papal government was growing desperate and critical. Pius IX.

[1] d'Haussonville, p. 188. [2] 1854. [3] Foisset, ii. p. 261.

began his reign with sympathetic efforts to reform the deplorable mismanagement of the Papal States. But his ideals could never be those of the Italian politicians. His minister Rossi was assassinated, and he himself compelled to escape for refuge. France thereupon intervened and the Pope was restored. But henceforth Pius was sickened of political reform. Reaction set in. Modern sympathies became discredited: the supporters of his former aims were dismissed and replaced by men of narrower views. Then Louis Napoleon interfered, demanding the secularization of the Roman government.

This movement in 1856 roused the opposition of Montalembert.[1]

Montalembert complained that for foreign statesmen to criticize in public the government of the Papal States was to contravene the accepted principle that the officials of one nation may not interfere in the domestic concerns of another people. He argued that it was unreasonable and unfair to single out for hostile criticism the government of the Papal States, while maintaining a discreet reserve and a cautious silence on the defects of every other nation. He considered the temporal government of the Papacy the most ancient and legitimate in the world. He claimed it as imperatively necessary for the spiritual independence of the Pope. And then he grew rhetorical and somewhat irrelevant on the treatment which the Papacy had received from Catholic sovereigns of the century. But he endeavoured to combine these remarks with sympathetic expressions towards the reformers of Italy, and with an acknowledgment that there was real need to reform the political condition.

[1] See Montalembert, *Works*, v. pp. 465–511.

Lacordaire, as a Catholic and a Liberal, sympathized both with the Papacy and with Italy. It seemed to him perfectly right for Italy to obtain its independence, and, on the other hand, that the Pope should retain his temporal domains. He saw no incompatibility in the two demands. He could not possibly approve the civil government of Rome as it then existed. Yet he could not openly speak his mind without causing serious offence. His experience had certainly demonstrated repeatedly the necessity for reserve and discretion.

Consequently he kept silence while Montalembert spoke. But his silence gave offence. Why did he not openly defend the Roman cause ?

At length in 1860 the *Univers* published an Encyclical of Pius IX. against Victor Emmanuel. For doing this the journal was immediately suppressed by the French Government. This act of despotism forced Lacordaire to speak. He wrote his essay on the liberty of the Church and Italy.[1]

Lacordaire declared that there was no greater misfortune for a nation than to be governed by another. Italy was right to claim independence of Austria. But Italy complained that the temporal dominion of the Papacy was the obstacle to its national unity. Lacordaire disputed the justice of this complaint. The temporal power of the Pope had existed a thousand years, and this duration was providential. If the Pope's temporal power caused harm to Italy, that was not due to the essential nature of this government, but only to incidental conditions. Pius IX. had laboured for reform ; and if ingratitude and perversity had extinguished his designs it was none the less true that he had attempted them.

[1] *Works*, vii. p. 301.

Lacordaire held that the Head of the Church had rather been sacrificed to the Italian Prince, than the Italian Prince to the Head of the Church. The Pope was almost invariably an Italian. For several centuries he had never ceased to be so. His Cardinals were chiefly Italians.

But, ran the objection, the temporal power of the Pope prevented the consolidation of Italy into a single kingdom. Lacordaire disputed whether this was any misfortune. Germany was no more a numerical unit than Italy. The United States were not a kingdom but a confederation. He asked whether they were any the less in reality a nation? Lacordaire did not hint that the one was by choice and the other by necessity. Nor did he reconcile this compulsion with the liberal right of a people to determine its form of government. He saw nothing incompatible with national freedom in the temporal power of Rome.

The temporal government of Rome was a government of the ancient kind. It compared favourably with other governments of that sort. It was a little feeble no doubt; but that was only because it introduced into civil affairs the gentleness of Christ.

No doubt there are governments of the modern kind: founded on civil equality, political liberty, and freedom of conscience. This was the case in France. Pius IX. had attempted in Rome to meet the modern ideas. But when his minister fell by the blow of an assassin at the door of the national assembly which Pius himself had created, who can wonder if the Pope despaired of his generation?

According to Lacordaire the Italian demand for national unity was placing an insurmountable barrier between themselves and the whole Catholic world.

This meant apparently that Italy ought contentedly to sacrifice its national aspirations to the cause of the Catholic world. If the independence of a nation is its very life, said Lacordaire, what about that of the Catholic Church ?

A last trial still remained for him. At fifty-eight years of age his strength gave way. Readers of Father Chocarne's *Life* will perhaps wonder whether that strength was not partially undermined by his austerities which, added to the nervous exhaustion of his work as a preacher, told upon a highly-strung and peculiarly sensitive constitution. He had the strength to go to Paris in January, 1861, to deliver his address at his reception into the French Academy. There M. Guizot received him. "It was a curious spectacle," says Count d'Haussonville, "to see the Protestant welcoming the Dominican. But Lacordaire retired to Sorèze only to die. He lingered for some months. He lost the power of speech : but his intellect was still alive. Suddenly, as he lay dying, he drew himself up in his bed, and cried out : 'My God ! my God ! Open unto me ! Open unto me ! ' It was the last utterance of those eloquent lips."

The sermons of Lacordaire are magnificent in their elevation and their eloquence. It is impossible to say what they might not have been if his theological teaching had equalled his gifts. But his critics were not without excuse when they complained of his doctrinal inaccuracies. His biographer, Foisset, admits that he was not sufficiently trained as a theologian. His studies were not sufficiently prolonged. On the other hand, his conference on the Trinity is a masterpiece of theological exposition. But he had never really studied history. Brilliant and imposing general-

izations are allowed not infrequently to take the place of critical study and the grasp of fact. His knowledge of Scripture shows the same defects. His rhetoric at times is splendid, but it is not theology.

His Ultramontanism is curiously incongruous with his liberalism, and is far less thought out. His training at Saint-Sulpice was Gallican rather than Ultramontane. It was the Gallican principles which predominated in the text-books of the college and in the convictions of most of the French Episcopate. But the despotic conduct of the Bishops in France, and their repudiation of modern ideas, led Lacordaire not unnaturally to seek a superior over them in Rome. But the Ultramontanism of Lacordaire was far more practical than dogmatic. There seems no trace that he had really thought it out. There was a lurking admiration for Gallicanism even in his Ultramontane proclivities. He came to suppose that the older Gallicanism was dead. He certainly did not realize how the belief in the episcopal conception of the Church as against the monarchical would arise for a fierce, if final, effort in the Council of 1870. That, of course, he never lived to see. But he said with sympathy that the kind of Gallicanism which consists in fearing the extension of unlimited power over two hundred million intelligent beings across the world, that is a Gallicanism which is very living and very formidable; because it is based on an instinct which is natural and even Christian. Here the Liberal peeps through the Ultramontane.

It is open to question whether Lacordaire's detractors were not in some respects more penetrating than himself, and better judges of the real tendency of his deepest principles.

It is said by French writers that the influence of Lacordaire on French preaching was remarkable. This was bound to be the case owing to his vigorous originality. His sermons are so manifestly the product of a very independent mind as well as of a powerful character. The conventional style hitherto prevalent, diffuse and commonplace, amid great dearth of thought, was put to flight by the splendour of this man on fire with a message. Ravignan, who took Lacordaire's place at Notre-Dame, after his sudden withdrawal, was incomparably less original than he. But Madame Swetchine remarked how he paid to the genius of his greater predecessor the tribute of a not altogether successful imitation. There was no need for imitation. Ravignan had an incisive austerity of style all his own. And imitation generally succeeds in parodying and reproducing just the very things which ought never to be reproduced. But as a study for preachers Lacordaire is excellent. He has exerted considerable influence over Englishmen, and more than one distinguished preacher of this country has obviously profited by the preacher of Notre-Dame.

III

MONTALEMBERT

Charles Forbes René de Montalembert, peer of France, was born in London in Albemarle Street, in 1810. His mother was a Scottish lady and a member of the Episcopal Church ; his father was a Roman Catholic. He was brought up in his father's faith. He was transferred to France at an early age, irregularly educated, studious, precocious, independent, in the care of his mother, whose intellectual tastes were meagre, who had no sympathy with his literary interests, and whose influence over him never seems to have been great. The lad read late at night, taking precautions, like Herbert Spencer, that his mother, as she passed his door, should not detect the glimmer of the light still burning.

At the age of seventeen he was placed in a school in Paris, while his father discharged diplomatic functions at Stockholm. Here he found himself in an atmosphere aggressively sceptical. Montalembert showed the qualities of his character at once. He appears to have been not only wholly unshaken but strengthened in his convictions by the unbelief of the majority. He stood already for his lifelong banner : liberalism and Christianity ; the latter to the scandal of his comrades, who on one occasion put to the vote the question whether God exists. The Deity, says Lecanuet, was

an unsuccessful candidate for the privilege of existence. Montalembert stood for Religion almost alone. But he held his ground with extraordinary fearlessness and tenacity.

The double influence of his parentage affected him throughout his career. English literature was his early delight, English freedom his lasting admiration. He committed to memory the chief speeches of Edmund Burke, and went declaiming them through country places, greatly disconcerting the labourers who, suddenly confronted with his gesticulations and his rhetoric, could only suppose him a lunatic escaped. He laboured from early manhood to transfer to France the characteristic freedom of English institutions. Freedom was his first and latest love.

But deeper than his love of freedom was his love of the Church. The ideas which enthralled his youthful mind were God and the Church far more than France and liberty.

Neither the Church nor freedom was understood in the France of 1830. It was the year of the Revolution which deposed Charles X., and replaced him by the limited eighteen years' monarchy of Louis Philippe. The consequences of the Revolution were by no means merely political. It affected every department of life and thought. The old was discounted precisely because it was the old. For the old conditions were detestable. The attempt to replace everything appeared in the religious sphere as well as in the secular. The Church seemed conquered as well as the monarchy. The Concordat had bound the Church to Government and enslaved it ; and the reaction against despotism in the State included revolt against Catholicism also. A memorial service in a church in Paris, popularly under-

stood as a Legitimist demonstration, led to a riot, in which the church was wrecked, and for seven years left a melancholy ruin. The splendid palace of the Archbishop of Paris was also destroyed, and the library, said to be the richest collection of ecclesiastical works in France, thrown into the Seine, while the Government manifested irresolution and feebleness, and virtually allowed what it took no adequate measures to prevent.[1] Archbishop de Quélen himself was forced to withdraw into concealment, and no priest dare appear in the street in clerical dress.

Louis Veuillot wrote that in the town in which he lived there were doubtless many good people, but there was not a man of his acquaintance, not one, whether officer, teacher, or magistrate, old or young, who fulfilled his religious duties.[2] Montalembert himself declared that the presence of a young man in church at that period created as much surprise as the visit of a Christian to a Mohammedan mosque.

Such was France of 1830, as it appeared to an ardent Catholic twenty years of age.

All these contemporary experiences forced on the young man's mind the social and religious problems of his time. All life was in revolt. He had himself beheld the Cross, the central emblem of the Christian Faith, publicly, almost officially, thrown down. Freedom, real freedom, was in many spheres misunderstood, and in some prohibited.

Montalembert felt that the great necessity of modern life was liberty.[3] But real liberty cannot exist without authority. Montalembert guards himself against any assertion of freedom as a universal right applicable

[1] Thureau-Dangin, i. 246 ff. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 252.
[3] *Œuvres Polémiques*, v. p. 60.

to all ages and all peoples.[1] All he claims is that in the actual state of the world freedom is good, not absolutely but relatively good.

The obstacle to freedom is despotism in the State. It made no essential difference, in Montalembert's view, whether despotism took the form of Monarchy or of Democracy.[2] He repudiated the despotism of the one, but he loathed the despotism of the many. He waxed righteously indignant against the tyranny of Louis XIV., and the maxim that His Majesty would inflict the severest treatment on those who refused to follow *his* religion.[3] But Montalembert reserved his profoundest contempt for Democracy. Democracy, according to Montalembert, is incompatible with freedom, because it springs from low-minded jealousy under the pretext of equality.[4] It degrades a man to servile adoration of the so-called reason and goodness of the masses. It is the ruin of all independence, all dignity, and all resistance. If Charles III. of Spain expelled the Jesuits from his empire "for reasons which His Majesty retained in his august mind"[5] and has not divulged to posterity, the caprice of the single will is not in Montalembert's opinion the least bit more capricious, more governed by passion, more perverse, than the will of a whole Democracy. Yet it was futile to look wistfully back towards the bygone age of monarchial absolutism. Imprudent apologists of the *ancien régime* should be warned that they have more to lose than to gain by such hopeless aspirations.[6] Men who were timorous of the perils of freedom should remember the perils of slavery. The great hope for the Church and the world was that the Church should

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 61. [2] p. 68. [3] p. 123.
[4] p. 68. [5] p. 148. [6] p. 154.

be free, and this freedom it was impossible to acquire in modern life without freedom for all.

It was the crusade of freedom which brought Montalembert and Lacordaire together. Not that their ideals of freedom were by any means the same. Lacordaire was of the middle classes, a democrat throughout. Montalembert was just as much a liberal, but a born aristocrat, and true to his aristocratic instincts to the end. None the less, the two united in the defence of liberty. Lacordaire the democrat *tutoyed* the peer in terms of more than complete equality. The democrat condoled with the aristocrat on the misfortune of his high birth, not exactly to the latter's satisfaction. Had he not the right to be proud of his inheritance? Montalembert replied with severe criticisms on the infernal temper of modern Democracy. Lacordaire retaliated with equally forcible remarks on monarchial absolutism and aristocratic vanity. Montalembert admits defects but defended his order.[1] Lacordaire said he loved the nobleman almost as much as if he had been a plebeian. The young layman's splendid enthusiasm for freedom won the deepest admiration of the priest. Many experiences in life threw them both together, yet each to the end was tinged with his independent traditions.

The two men resolved to defy the law which restricted to certain Governmentally recognized schools the right of giving education. This restriction, which gravely affected the interests of religion, and crippled the energies of Catholics, they considered to be a violation of the Concordat of 1801; to be resisted therefore alike in the interests of the State and of the Church. Accordingly, they determined to open a school and

[1] Lecanuet, i. pp. 184–6.

begin to teach on their own account. Both Montalembert and Lacordaire were masters. In the presence of numerous admiring visitors and some dozen children, Lacordaire inaugurated the new movement with a somewhat theatrical speech. Next morning the police appeared, declared the school closed, and ordered the children not to return on the following day. Lacordaire told them they were to come, and they came. The police reappeared. Lacordaire remonstrated. The police insisted, led the children out, and the masters gave way to a technical manifestation of force.[1]

The next phase of the incident was the trial of the two masters in court. The court, however, declared the matter to be beyond its jurisdiction. Then the Government, determined not to be baffled, ordered a new trial. The date was fixed. In the interval, however, Montalembert's father died. Consequently, Montalembert succeeded to the peerage. Thereupon he claimed the right to be tried before the House of Peers; and, as the case could not be divided, the plebeian Lacordaire was to be tried before the same high authority.

The Peers were not pleased at being appealed to in a matter so insignificant, as they considered it. "If this young man were to drop a flower-pot from his window on the head of a passing peasant, would he claim the right of assembling the House of Peers?" So muttered a discontented member of the higher court. And the feeling was fairly common. But it was difficult to refuse his right. And some admired his courage.

Montalembert's first speech in the House of Peers is a

[1] *Ibid.*, i. p. 233.

scene for an artist's pen. He was little more than a boy, addressing an assembly most difficult to move; grey-headed men, mostly sceptical, who had long ago lost what little faith they may have once possessed, if indeed they ever had any. He stood before them like some young prophet, in the ardour of an unassailable conviction which swept all obstacles before it. They looked on him with curious but not unsympathetic eyes. They were by no means insensible to the force which such faith creates. There was a driving power about it which was at least an enviable possession. They owned that the young man's speech in defence of his case was a fine example of lofty ideas and youthful eloquence. It moved to admiration and applause. But it had no effect on the legal decision: unless, indeed, the infliction of the smallest fine permissible in such a case bore witness to the speaker's influence.[1]

Outside the court, however, on the nation at large, the effect was great. Years afterwards, the abolition of the University monopoly, and the legalizing of freedom of instruction by the De Falloux Law (1850), was traced back to the protest of Montalembert and Lacordaire.

Montalembert's connection with Lamennais began about the same time as that with Lacordaire. Lamennais was deeply impressed by the young man's zeal, and recorded in his diary that the interview was perhaps one of the most important days of his life. The clever and maturer mind thoroughly appreciated the young man's exceptional capacities. Montalembert did much to finance the *Avenir*. He did more for that journal by the splendid eloquence of his contributions.

Montalembert, as an Ultramontane, joined zealously

[1] See Guizot, *Memoires*, iii. p. 94; and Thureau-Dangin.

in the onslaught upon Gallican ideas. He fully concurred with Lamennais in advocating the disestablishment of the French Church, and the entire separation of the spiritual order from the State. The independent action of the spiritual authority unimpeded by secular control was, to his mind, worth any sacrifice of money or prestige. He was ready to face any risks. But his action scandalized the French Episcopate. They were chiefly Gallicans. They proceeded to retaliate in the absolutist manner characteristic of the period. They adopted a systematic policy of suppression.[1] They prohibited the reading of the journal; dismissed professors and parochial clergy who favoured the new ideas, and refused ordination to seminarists tainted with them. They also invoked the aid of Rome to censure these revolutionary journalists who disturbed the Church and offended the faithful.

Crippled by such opposition from ecclesiastical authority; their journal afflicted with a diminishing circulation, and threatened with extinction; the directors thought the only remedy open was a counter-appeal to Rome. Montalembert, indeed, had misgivings. What if Rome were to condemn? Lamennais replied, with an assurance which carried all objections before it, that such a fate was simply impossible. So the visit to Rome was undertaken.

Montalembert has left on record his impressions of their audience with Gregory XVI. The young man entered in all the glow of his fervid enthusiasm into the presence which to his historical and religious imagination denoted the supreme embodiment of spiritual power on earth; and he was profoundly disappointed.

He found a simple and somewhat undignified old

[1] p. 271.

man, who talked of Lamennais' brother and Montalembert's mother ;[1] quoted the witty saying of some Cardinal, that there was no Purgatory for Frenchmen : they went either straight to hell or else to heaven ; discoursed about a statue of Michael Angelo, and dismissed them without one word connected with the mission upon which they came.

Montalembert's disconsolate departure from the city followed shortly on this disappointing interview.

When the secret workings of the Curia finally appeared in the Papal Brief, and the *Avenir* was condemned, Montalembert felt completely crushed. He said it was the ruin of his religious life. He corresponded with Lamennais, vowing him eternal devotion. Then came Lacordaire's complete and final severance from Lamennais. Lacordaire saw distinctly the direction in which Lamennais was moving. That the master contemplated rupture with the Church, Montalembert at first refused to believe. He still clung to the older man with all a young disciple's ardent admiration. But when the master's despair of the ecclesiastical authorities became too plain to be denied, Montalembert grew afraid. He pleaded that all Lamennais' past wholly identified him with the Catholic cause. To abandon his position as priest and Ultramontane would be to cut his life in two. Montalembert prophesied that the latter half would not rival the former in power, originality, or distinction. That a father of the Church should become the head of a schism, would be a scandal to Christendom. Let Lamennais devote himself to study.

It was affectionate advice, but vain. In the bitterness of his spirit, Lamennais scattered bitter words

[1] Lecanuet, i. p. 237.

broadcast among his friends. Montalembert discovered that every movement of Lamennais's circle was reported to Rome.[1] Copies of letters imprudently sent by Lamennais to his imprudent admirers, in which he spoke his mind in no measured terms about the Encyclical, were being read at the Vatican. Montalembert counselled prudence and silence and discretion: none of which graces were congenial to Lamennais' exasperated feelings, or indeed to his disposition.

Then followed a long fierce fight between Lamennais and Lacordaire for the possession of Montalembert's soul. The elder man put out all his genius to encourage him to revolt. Lacordaire lavished all the tenderness and sympathy of which he was capable in the effort to secure Montalembert's loyalty to the Church. In force, in irony, in severity, Lamennais was far the superior. He was in the full strength and maturity of his genius. But in his efforts there was singularly little love. There was bitterness, scorn, contempt: on these Lamennais rang the changes. But Lacordaire's influence was stronger, because filled through and through with sympathy. Lamennais grew more and more aloof from the fundamental principles of the Faith. His condemnation at Rome threw doubt and insecurity on many Catholic ideas. Henceforth he said he was resolved to cease all priestly functions. The example created in Montalembert a strong reaction. He had no desire to find himself, at the age of twenty-four, excluded from the community of the faithful. Accordingly he sent to Rome a full and complete submission. Lamennais' comment was characteristic: "What a pity that with such an excellent heart he has not a better head!"[2]

[1] *Ibid.*, i. p. 391. [2] *Ibid.*, i. p. 443.

Montalembert renewed his crusade for freedom in the sphere of education at a time of the Church's unpopularity.[1] Under Louis XVIII. the interests of the monarchy and of the Church were closely united. The old University monopoly of education was retained, yet relaxed. Bishop Frayssinous was put at the head of it, and made Minister of Education; and priests were now admitted among the professors.[2] Guizot argues in his *Memoires* that the University monopoly was, in practice, exercised with moderation, but he owns that the theory accepted by the French Government at the time was that in education the State is supreme outside the limits of the home. A father may educate his child in person, but the moment he relinquishes that right the child falls under the control of the State. A father was not allowed to authorize any person unrecognized by the State to educate his child for him.

Guizot excuses this despotic State control on the ground that France was only emerging from revolutionary anarchy. But liberalism naturally clamoured against this restriction on liberty. And if the liberals reproached it with despotism the Catholics reproached it with irreligion.[3] Catholics naturally had no confidence in the majority of the authorized schoolmasters. They desired the restoration of the religious orders, and instruction given by men who were recognized believers in the Catholic Faith. Hence the continued crusade for freedom in education. On the other side, the immense majority of the French people regarded the movement with suspicion. They saw in ecclesiastical liberty the precursor and the instrument of ecclesiastical domination.[4] The great mass of Frenchmen

[1] 1844. [2] Guizot, *Memoires*, t. iii. p. 91.
[3] Guizot, iii. pp. 88, 89 (1830). [4] p. 103.

was captured by Voltairian principles. The theory they deprecated most was that public education should be handed over to the Jesuits.

Guizot, Protestant though he was, acted with conspicuous impartiality; indeed, with a marked desire to remove an injustice. He proposed a law maintaining the University, but permitting the creation of rival systems of education.[1] But Guizot's plan was partly vitiated by the interpolation of a section requiring every teacher to declare on oath that he was not a member of any unauthorized corporation.[2] Even this mutilated attempt came to nothing, It passed the Chamber of Deputies, but the Cabinet was dissolved before it reached the Chamber of Peers, and Guizot went out and his project with him.[3]

Montalembert resolved not to act without the support of the Bishops, which, however, it was no easy matter to secure. Mgr. Affre, De Quélen's successor in the Archbishopric of Paris, did not share the prejudices of De Quélen and the older clergy, but he disbelieved in the modern methods of public agitation. Thureau-Dangin says that Affre had imbibed at Saint-Sulpice the maxim that what is good makes no noise, and what is noisy makes no good.[4] And he thoroughly believed it. But he came under Montalembert's influence and yielded. Montalembert wrote incessantly to all the Bishops in order to win them to his views, and succeeded in gaining most of them. Then he endeavoured to rouse the Catholic laity, whom he roundly accused of apathy and lack of courage. Madame de Montalembert's illness drew Montalembert to reside two years out of France. But nothing could

[1] Guizot, *Memoires*, iii. p. 105. [2] p. 107.
[3] iii. p. 109. [4] Thureau-Dangin, iii. p. 489.

reduce his zeal or slacken his energies. From Madeira he wrote his well-known pamphlet on the duty of Catholics in the matter of freedom of teaching (1843).

Montalembert disbelieved entirely in any attempt to improve the University teaching in a religious direction. He was convinced that any State institution could, under existing circumstances, only represent indifference in matters of faith. Such indifference was not the fault of the State, but the result of modern social conditions. But he insisted that such indifference was never to be imposed on persons who cared about preserving the faith of their children. Freedom of teaching could not be a monopoly of the State: it must be granted to all.

The restoration in France of a Catholic State, such as had existed from Clovis to Louis XIV., was, as Montalembert saw, hopelessly impossible. Catholics must create a Catholic party. Montalembert did not mean that this was necessarily a permanent condition, still less an ideal one. It was the outcome of the political revolution of 1830.[1]

These were the circumstances under which Montalembert carried his crusade for freedom in education into the Chamber of Peers.[2] In his famous "*Discours sur la Liberté de l'Église*, he not only pleaded passionately for Catholic liberty, but flung out the defiant words, "We are sons of the Crusaders, and we shall not yield to the sons of Voltaire." In this effort Montalembert won the support of the whole French Episcopate.

The opposition proposed a compromise. Montalembert had evidently roused the nation. He had the sympathy of the Liberal as well as of the Catholic.

[1] *Ibid.*, iii. p. 486. [2] Lecanuet, ii. p. 190 (1884).

Some concession must be made. It was suggested that Catholics should be granted freedom of teaching, provided that the religious orders were disallowed. Victor Cousin took this line, especially attacking the Jesuit Institution. Villemain did the same.

Montalembert defended the Jesuits. He was, as usual, extremely eloquent. But he made no serious attempt to explain the general unpopularity of the Society in France. He generalized on the value of their historic influence. He drew brilliant sketches of their world-wide labours. But he said little calculated to answer the real objections, or to bring conviction to the other side.[1]

He did not, even in important instances, convince his friends. Lacordaire cautioned him. The shrewd and penetrating mind of the priest was not led away by the layman's rhetoric. Lacordaire did not think it possible for the Jesuits to control educational institutions in France, until they had overcome a widespread aversion, and got themselves appreciated.

However, Montalembert was in no mood for caution. He was out for defence. He identified the cause of the Jesuits with that of the Church.

Great was his disgust when the Archbishop of Paris sided with the Government against the Jesuit Society. Mgr. Affre had never loved the Order. Montalembert expostulated, but in vain. His partisans said openly that Paris was the Rome of Gallicans and heretics.

Dupanloup agreed with Lacordaire, and advised Montalembert to proceed with caution in his advocacy of the Jesuit cause. On the other hand, the Nuncio declared that Rome would never sacrifice the Jesuits to French dislike.

[1] *Ibid.*, ii. p. 252.

However, there were influences at work which neither Montalembert nor even the Nuncio knew of. Secret overtures were made by the French Government to Rome, representing that the dissolution of the Order as far as France was concerned was essential to religious security and political peace. While Montalembert defended them in Paris, Gregory XVI. assembled the Cardinals in Rome, and propounded the demand of the French Government. The Cardinals unanimously advised that the French demand should be supported in no way whatever. But the Pope was not convinced. His Secretary of State was sent to the Jesuit General to induce him to make this concession to the Government of France. To that pressure, exerted very strongly in the Pope's behalf, the General yielded.

When the news arrived in France, Lecanuet says that Montalembert simply refused to believe it.[1] He inquired at the Nunciature, and was informed that nothing was known about it there. However, it was true. Montalembert was scandalized. It seemed to him that Rome had made itself the cat's-paw of France. He pointed to the effect of this incident on other Governments. In the English Parliament it was being argued that it was absurd to legalize the existence of Jesuits in England at the very moment when the Pope was disbanding them in France. Were the labours of Catholic laymen to be discouraged and ignored while the subtle schemes by which unbelieving statesmen sought to neutralize Catholic influence were encouraged and endorsed? Montalembert had not expected to incur the cynical accusation of being more Catholic than the Pope. In his profound disgust he

[1] *Ibid.*, ii. p. 260.

went so far as to quote the words of St. Thomas of Canterbury: "I know not how it is, but at Rome men always prefer Barabbas to Christ."

Nominally, therefore, the Jesuits were dispersed. But in reality they only subdivided. They opened more houses, and became more widely spread through France. With this result the Government seemed satisfied. The Papal Secretary of State pointed complaisantly to this result of Roman sagacity. But Montalembert contemplated not the success but the means by which it was achieved. This system of concession was to his mind altogether ignoble. It surrendered freedom of conscience to the transitory requirements of the State. It gave the sanction of the Church to a principle which of all others was most disastrous to the real interest of the Church itself. Diplomatic intrigue sickened the lofty idealist.

Montalembert's outspoken defence of their Order won him the highest regard from the Jesuit Society. None the less he was by no means blind to their serious defects. He told them with engaging frankness that they were not sufficiently modern; that they failed to realize the force of modern events and the value of modern ideas. They were enemies to liberty. Twenty thousand Frenchmen had been pupils in their schools, and yet were no better than a feeble unenthusiastic indifferent race in matters of religion. Not one of the chief Catholic laymen of the day was the product of Jesuit influence.[1]

The Jesuit Ravignan replied, admitting most of the criticisms, but ascribing the defect to the homes from which the pupils came, and to the general incredulity and laxity of the age.

[1] Lecanuet, ii. p. 274.

Montalembert is probably remembered in England chiefly for his work on the monks of the West. The admirable English translation has greatly extended its popularity. Montalembert was, of course, an orator, not a critical historian. No one would turn to his pages for scholarly and laborious research. But for glowing ardour, for warmth and richness of colouring, for picturesqueness and beauty of expression, his eloquent descriptions would be difficult to match. It is a work of edification, pervaded throughout by the fire of a burning faith. It would not be reasonable to subject so artistic a production to a relentless scrutiny.

It was the curious but not entirely unnatural fate of such a work to encounter the fire of two opposing schools. Montalembert recorded the miraculous mediæval legends on a large and lavish scale ; but he selected and freely omitted. Consequently, the narrower school of French piety accused him of a rationalistic bias. On the other hand, the Protestant school criticized him for too much credulity. Between this double attack he found it difficult to escape. He remarked that he had nowhere declared his belief in the legends which he recorded, but only the fact that the legends had been believed, and had occupied an important place in the monastic and ecclesiastical history. This would hardly satisfy either school. Certainly not the narrower. It made his action worse. Nor indeed the broader, for he had exercised his criticism uncritically.

These things, however, were minor blemishes. Critics mistook the whole spirit of the work. The splendour of Montalembert's production lies in the life and reality which he has infused into the scenes of

remote religious faith. The deep sincerity and vivid imagination conspicuous on every page deserve a more generous estimate. Artistic power inspired by personal faith achieves in Montalembert's pages one of its most splendid manifestations.

Montalembert combined his liberalism with advocacy of the temporal power of the Pope. That a nation had a right to organize itself on any method intrinsically reasonable was acknowledged, nay asserted, in the case of every country except Italy. There were Catholics who would contemplate the Papal loss of temporal power with more than equanimity.[1] Not so Montalembert. It was for him the most ancient and most legitimate sovereignty in the whole world. He declared that the Papacy was the only living glory which Italy possessed. To touch that was to touch Italy's best interests.[2] And on the religious side, to violate the temporal sovereignty of the Pope was to violate an essential of the Papacy, that is to say, the foundation of the Catholic Church ;[3] such temporal sovereignty being, in Montalembert's view, under the conditions of modern society, essential to the freedom of the head of the Church.[4] The independent exercise of spiritual power depended upon the temporal independence of its possessor. It was the interest of every subject of the Pope in every country of the world.[5] Napoleon himself acknowledged it. The Pope was far from Paris, and that was well. "He is neither at Madrid nor Vienna ; that is only, we suppose, his spiritual authority. If he were at Vienna or Madrid do you suppose that Paris would consent to receive

[1] Lecanuet, ii. p. 444.

[2] Montalembert, *Pie IX. et Lord Palmerston : Œuvres Polémiques*, ii. p. 469.

[3] p. 477. [4] *Ibid.* [5] p. 482.

his decisions ?"[1] "Happily he is in Rome, with a tendency to respect his strongest empire. What, then, of Italy ? Italy must be sacrificed to the Papacy : or rather to the religious requirements of Europe. That is only fair. For, after all, it is Catholic Europe which has been the making of modern Rome. The Italian people, therefore, is not master of its own constitution in the same degree that other nations are."[2]

Under these impressions Montalembert resisted and protested against the efforts of Cavour and Napoleon to constitute national independence for Italy.

But what angered and distressed him most was the way in which English statesmen, Lord Palmerston in particular, criticized in Parliament the deplorable condition of the States under Papal government. If the English Parliament was engaged on a moral crusade against all degraded government, why was it silent over the abominable government of the Mohammedans in Constantinople ? This moral indignation for the bad, this concentration of zeal on Italy, provoked a cynical reflection, so long as glaring anomalies were discreetly overlooked. Was not the interference of one government in the domestic concerns of another a violation of a first principle in international relationship ? Montalembert waxed wrathful, vehement. His shafts went home. For afterwards, when he was nominated Ambassador to London, Palmerston refused to accept him.

Nevertheless, in spite of Montalembert's eloquence, the anomalies of the Papal sovereignty, the confusion of its spiritual and temporal aspects, at least for Italy, was the theme of severest criticism from members of

[1] p. 485. [2] p. 484.

the Catholic Church. It was no Protestant, but a future Cardinal,[1] who observed that Gregory XVI. alternately blessed and shot his subjects, while Pius IX. contented himself with imprisoning them. These actions were inevitable if the Pope was to be safe in Rome.[2] They were none the less a painful discrepancy in Christendom.

The best of all Montalembert's expositions of freedom is found in his addresses to the Congress of Malines in 1863. Here he put out all his strength. He adopted as his banner the phrase, *l'Église libre dans l'État libre.* He warned his hearers that Catholics in general were inferior to their opponents because they had not yet assumed their fitting place in modern movements among the people. They exhibited a mixture of embarrassment and timidity in confronting modern social life.[3] They were, without realizing it, far too much men of the *ancien régime :* that is to say, of the *régime* which acknowledged neither civil equality nor political liberty, nor liberty of conscience. He told them that the future of modern social life depended on two things : on modifying Democracy by freedom, and on reconciling Catholicism with Democracy.[4] Catholics are compelled to live, whether they like it or not, in the midst of Democracy ; and if they are to exert a salutary influence upon it they must learn to accept the conditions essential to modern society.[5] He attempted to show from history what had been the consequences to the Church of restricting the freedom of others, and the use of coercion in religion. He said, without hesitation, that the revocation of the Edict of Nantes was one of the principal causes of the irreligion of the

[1] Meignan. [2] Lecanuet, iii. p. 219.
[3] Lecanuet, p. 10. [4] p. 18. [5] p. 19.

eighteenth century.[1] He pointed out that in 1830 priests (Lacordaire among the number) were forced to go about the streets of Paris in lay disguise, while in 1848, the same Lacordaire appeared in public assemblies in his Dominican garb.[2] And the reason for the change was this: that in the former period the State protected the Church, and in the latter persecuted it. For the less the Church is identified with secular government, and the less it relies upon it, the stronger and more popular it becomes in modern social life.[3] Montalembert frankly confessed that his enthusiastic devotion to religious freedom was not prevalent among Catholics.[4] They wanted freedom for themselves, but that was all. Freedom for the conscience of another, religious liberty in itself, freedom for kinds of worship which they disliked and rejected, this alarmed them. They rejected such freedom as anti-Christian in origin, as maintained by the Church's enemies, and as likely to inflict upon themselves more loss than gain.[5] Every one of these pretexts Montalembert denied. He contended that it was impossible in these days to demand freedom for truth, that is to say, for one's self (for every man of good faith considers what he holds is truth), and refuse it to error, that is to say, to those who do not agree with us.[6]

Montalembert was careful to enter the proviso more than once, that he did not speak as a theologian, but simply as a politician and an historian.[7] He laid down no dogma, no abstract theory at all, but simply a practical inference drawn from existing facts. It was with him a question how Catholics must act under

[1] Lecanuet, iii. p. 28. [2] p. 30. [3] p. 31.
[4] p. 97. [5] p. 98. [6] p. 133.
[7] pp. 46 and 93.

present conditions.[1] And what their duty was, seemed to him as obvious as light.

But Montalembert's view of liberty gave great offence. What he propounded as a practical necessity was understood to imply a dogmatic conception. His proposals were certainly incompatible with orthodoxy as understood by Veuillot and the *Univers*. His opponents went to work as none can work but the perverse devout. They insinuated doubts concerning the reality of Montalembert's religion. Inquiries were made whether he really held the faith at all; whether he ever went to Mass. The Bishop of Poitiers, Mgr. Pie, whose ardour was surpassed by nothing except his narrowness, constituted himself chief agitator against the advocate of liberty. The Bishop did his utmost to secure a condemnation of the speech on liberty in Rome. What astonished Montalembert most, says Lecanuet, was to find that English Catholics, themselves but recently liberated from penal legislation, were fiercely opposing the principle of religious liberty.[2]

At Rome the Jesuits, together with Mgr. Talbot, well known as Manning's friend, and Cardinal Pitra, a good, learned, but narrow man, were scandalized at Montalembert's ideas.

Montalembert was in the first rank of popular speakers. He was the orator of the Ultramontanes: the glowing, impassioned advocate of a party, with the advocate's defects. He seldom saw the force of the arguments on the other side. His eloquence ran away with him. His vehemence not infrequently alarmed his own supporters. He was bluntly told by friends on one occasion that he was only useful for the defence of lost causes, for he compromised all others by his

[1] p. 93. [2] p. 363.

vehemence.[1] He overwhelmed rather than convinced or persuaded. The rhetorical weapons of irony and imagination, the telling repartee, were more congenial to his temperament than balanced statements, or measured and careful replies. But he was brilliant and thrilling. Compared with other Parliamentary speakers of his time, he was recognized to be *facile princeps*. Nisard, comparing him with Thiers and Guizot, observed that Thiers is always somewhat of a journalist, Guizot is a professor, Montalembert is eloquence itself. Thiers is for every day, Guizot for Sundays, Montalembert for the four great festivals of the year.[2]

But while Montalembert pursued his crusade for freedom in France and Belgium, a very different course was being taken in Rome. Pius IX. had long contemplated an Encyclical against modern errors. Upon December 8, 1864, out it came, this celebrated document, the Encyclical *Quanta cura*, accompanied by the Syllabus, or list of eighty condemned propositions. The Encyclical condemned, among other things, the maxim that liberty of conscience and of worship is the inherent right of every man.[3] This maxim was characterized as modern. The whole Encyclical was out of touch with modern life, and showed no capacity to understand it. Among the propositions condemned was the principle that every man is free to embrace and profess the religion which, according to the light of reason, he considers to be true;[4] that the Church has no right to force;[5] that the arbitrary conduct of Roman Pontiffs promoted the division between East and West;[6] that the Church ought to be separated

[1] Lecanuet, ii. p. 441. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 338.
[3] Raulx, *Encyclique et Documents*, i. p. 7.
[4] Syllabus, xv. [5] *Ibid.*, xxiv. [6] *Ibid.*, xxxviii.

from the State, and the State from the Church; that at the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other worship.[1]

This product of Roman authority filled certain sections of the Roman obedience with profound dismay. It seemed to them a deliberate attack on modern liberty. Its opinions on Liberalism were understood to be directed especially against France; and the French Government retaliated by prohibiting the official circulation of the document.

On the other hand, the Ultramontane extreme declared that the Encyclical was necessary to suppress the frogs who croaked in their unwholesome marshes.[2] This was Veuillot's view. In his opinion opponents of the Syllabus were anti-Catholics. They were *avortons de l'enfer:* diabolical malformations.

Montalembert, however, stood at the head of these abortions. Certainly nothing could be more sharply contrasted than the Syllabus and the *l'Église libre dans l'État libre.* The one represented mediæval scholasticism, the other liberal Catholicism. The champion of freedom feared that his career was ended. He could not see how the public advocacy of liberty was any longer possible. In the Catholic ranks dismay was widely spread.

Distinctions indeed were made in the Pope's behalf. It was said that he was dealing with abstract principles, and not with the actual conditions of the day: with theory rather than with practice. But the propositions condemned included such matters as opinions on the conduct and influence of the Popes in their dealings with the East. Whether the division of

[1] *Ibid.*, lxxvii. [2] Lecanuet, iii. 383.

East and West was due in part to Papal aggressiveness is not a question of abstract principle, but of fact. All kinds of propositions, concrete, abstract, general, and affecting local circumstances, seemed mixed in one indiscriminate condemnation in the Syllabus of Pius IX. There is no doubt that the Papal document had gravely complicated the situation. False or true, the opportuneness of such a challenge was a matter of opinion in the Catholic world, and that opinion was very seriously divided. Every one felt that something should be said, but the inferior authorities of the Church were bewildered. They neither knew precisely what ought to be said nor who should venture to say it.

Then the great Bishop of Orleans came to the rescue. Dupanloup published an explanation of the Syllabus. It was adroit and clever. He poured contempt on various former renderings of the document. He won an easy victory over various misconceptions.[1] He said that what was condemned in the Syllabus was not liberty of worship, but religious indifference. The Pope himself allowed Jewish and Protestant worship, even in Rome.[2] Dupanloup quoted Tertullian's *non est religionis cogere religionem*,[3] but he still claimed for the Pope a paternal authority to punish, and did not pretend to limit that authority to spiritual weapons. He tried to turn the tables on the critics by criticizing their own presuppositions, and indicating the confusions of modern life. But he cannot be said to have really faced the main issues. He was engaged in a singularly difficult undertaking. A word too much and he might be himself disowned. He was skilfully steering his

[1] Dupanloup, *La Convention du 15 Septembre, et l'Encyclique du 8 Décembre : Nouvelles Œuvres Choisies*, IV. p. 309 ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 344. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 350, 351.

way between obstacles on either side ; and considering what those obstacles were, his *Apology* is a remarkable achievement. He said all that an able and zealous advocate, writing with one eye to Pius IX. and the other to Montalembert and the liberal Catholics, could possibly say.

And Dupanloup's *Apology for the Syllabus* achieved a great success. Six hundred Bishops wrote and thanked him for it. It circulated by hundreds of thousands. Pius himself wrote a Brief in approval.

Montalembert, however, was entirely unconvinced by Dupanloup's explanations. He thought the Papal document a disaster. He understood how by such things allegiance could be shaken. He read again the story of Lamennais' fall in order to ward himself off from a similar experience.[1] After all, the Pope was king : and whether he was constitutional or despotic, in either case it was necessary to obey. For five and thirty years Montalembert had devoted himself to the Papacy, and he would not let his closing period contradict his whole career. Such thoughts as these show how deeply the man was moved.

From this severe trial Montalembert never entirely recovered. Shortly after came the undermining of his constitution. He suffered a cruel martyrdom extending over several years.

Then came the last ecclesiastical event in Montalembert's life : the assembling of the Council at the Vatican in 1869. "He received the news," says Lecanuet, "with astonishment and rejoicing. But as soon as the real purpose of the Council became suspected, Montalembert changed his tone." A proposal to formulate a dogma of Papal Infallibility was not

[1] Lecanuet, iii. p. 395.

calculated to harmonize with his personal experience of absolute authority, nor with his conception of the requirements of modern life. In spite of his Ultramontane proclivities, he saw the imperative necessity for limitations on despotism. His matured experience had taught him forcibly that there are, after all, two sides to truth. The advocate of Papal claims became alarmed lest those claims should be injuriously increased. Whether he held or did not hold the idea of infallibility as a personal belief, he was too profoundly acquainted with the tendencies of his age to consider such a move as beneficial, or to contemplate it without the gravest alarm. While he was personally prepared to submit to anything which the Church dictated, he foresaw the dangers of such a decree, and, on the ground of probable social and political results, protested against it.

His divergence from the later policy of Pius IX. was painfully evident to him. There was after all little in common between Montalembert and Pius IX., as the Pope became in the later part of his administration, when in disgust at the results of his well-meant liberal overtures to Italy, he fell by reaction into a despotic policy. Montalembert formulated the divergence between himself and Rome when he called Pius IX. the Louis XIV. of the Papacy. What that phrase denoted for a liberal Catholic it is hardly necessary to describe.

This time Dupanloup and Montalembert were together. Dupanloup agreed with Montalembert's misgivings on the threatened decree, and issued his famous declaration on the inopportuneness of any definition of infallibility. Montalembert rejoiced, but suffered from no illusions.[1] He saw quite clearly that

[1] Lecanuet, iii. p. 457.

an isolated attack was not going to overthrow the Ultramontane endeavour. It would be a serious mistake, he wrote, "to suppose that the sound of Dupanloup's trumpet will make the walls of Jericho fall."

Montalembert tried to increase the forces. He urged Newman to go to Rome as Dupanloup's theologian. Newman could scarcely do otherwise than decline. As the Roman Bishops in England had ignored him, he could not go on the invitation of a Bishop in France.

Montalembert, then on his death-bed, read the abusive articles of the *Univers*. The most extravagant flatteries were addressed to Rome. The Pope was called the Christ on earth. Pulpit extravagances surpassed even this. A Bishop preached in Rome on the Three Incarnations of the Son of God: in the Virgin, in the Eucharist, and in the old man at the Vatican.[1]

On the other hand, Montalembert was challenged to say how he reconciled his opposition to the Ultramontane with his earlier opposition to the Gallican school. To this he made an extremely forcible reply. He asked who could have dreamed that the liberal Pontificate of Pius IX. in 1847 should ever become the Pontificate represented by the *Univers* of 1869? Who could possibly have foreseen the reaction of the present hour, the enthusiasm for despotism, the sacrifice of justice and truth, of reason and history wholesale to the idol of the Vatican?

The "idol of the Vatican"! That expression penetrated through the armour of the Ultramontane. The fierceness with which it was resented is shown in a

[1] *Ibid.*, iii. p. 466.

sermon by the Abbé Combalot, on the text, "Satan entered into Judas Iscariot."[1]

Pius himself lost his head. He burst out into the most vehement and unmeasured language in a Brief to Guéranger. The opponents of infallibility, he said, were men who gloried in the name of Catholic, but showed themselves entirely saturated with perverted principles, full of audacity, folly, impudence, hatred, violence, etc. etc.

Montalembert did not live to hear the doctrine which he had opposed proclaimed. Perhaps it may be truly said, *Felix opportunitate mortis.* When the news of his death reached Rome, the first emotions of Pius IX., says Ollivier, were not generous.[2] He solved the problem of Montalembert's opposition by a reference to the sin of pride. Unhappily, ecclesiastical animosities affected even the Requiem. The service arranged in Rome by the dead man's brother-in-law, himself a Bishop, was forbidden from the Vatican. Another service, without notice, was arranged elsewhere. Behind a screen Pius contemplated the ceremony, and shared in a none too edifying devotion. By way of excuse, it was said that a public ceremonial would have been converted into a party demonstration. Some thought that this is precisely what was actually achieved.

Montalembert's championship of the cause of freedom and of the Church is one of the most inspiring even among the religious movements of the nineteenth century. A more utterly sincere and selfless devotion it would be difficult to conceive. Rank, influence, wealth, personal genius, intense religious faith, are all

[1] Lecanuet, iii. p. 469.
[2] Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au Concile du Vatican*, ii. p. 175.

centred in him, and all were offered unreservedly in the service of the Divine Institution whose nature and property deserved from him the lavish expenditure of his best. That such a life of service was closed in the sadness of conflict with the Ultramontane developments within that Institution which was his glory and his joy, is not the least of the tragic results of the policy of Pius IX.

IV

LOUIS VEUILLOT

It is a somewhat formidable undertaking to write about a French journalist whose collected works are advertised as extending to forty volumes.[1] Forty volumes! It eclipses numerically the classical edition of Bossuet. Bossuet in the new edition of great French writers may, indeed, surpass it. But, in any case, what a huge array!

Louis Veuillot was indeed no ordinary person in the world of letters. A man of exceptional abilities in exceptional times, he played so important a part in the religious and political history of France during the latter half of the nineteenth century that French Catholicism can hardly be described without him. A born journalist and keen observer, living in Paris through the Siege, and in Rome through the Vatican Council, he saw much of conflict, both religious and political, and was thoroughly saturated with the militant spirit.

About the year 1830 there came into existence a journal created expressly to defend the interests of the Church. The *Univers* was to be the special organ for French Catholicism. For some years the journal existed rather than thrived. Then the proprietor

[1] *Œuvres de L. Veuillot.* Paris: Lethielleux. 1914. *Correspondance de L. V.*, nine vols.

confided its fate to Louis Veuillot, and from that time the fortune of the journal was made.

It was a daring venture, for Louis Veuillot's style was secularity itself. It might be suitable enough in the political world. If hard hitting and raillery, caricature and personality, were the aim of a religious paper, no better choice could possibly be made than Louis Veuillot. If sustained elevation of thought, argumentative force, courtesy and considerateness were required, then it would be necessary to look elsewhere. Veuillot's strength did not lie in that direction.

It has been said of Veuillot, by a French historian, that he grasped instinctively the secrets of the French language. That marvellous instrument of speech yielded in his masterful control to all the shades of anger and contempt and irony and derision. He was more incisive than measured, more forcible than graceful; at times he sank into positive vulgarity. But this very vulgarity contributed not a little to his success. His ridicule so captured the imagination that many of his readers could see little else.[1]

Veuillot supported the scholasticism of Pius IX. in the style of a Voltaire. Voltaire now haunted the sacristies, and had become an Ultramontane.[2] Nothing could exceed the intensity of Veuillot's hate towards every thing and every person who opposed the most extreme extension of Papal power. He knew the weakness of his opponents, and it cannot be said that he spared them.

His articles on Dogmatic themes are not the serious arguments of a theological mind. They show no

[1] P. de la Gorce, *Histoire du Second Empire*, vol. ii. pp. 155, 156.
[2] p. 156.

comprehension of the depth of the problems raised. They are the bantering and exasperating attacks of an advocate bent on ruining the credit of the other side.

"I put vinegar into my ink," Veuillot admitted; "but," he added, "I do not put poison."[1] That was doubtless true of his intention, but not of the result.

By far the most memorable part of Veuillot's life is his share in the great struggle for Papal infallibility. Veuillot threw himself wholly and entirely into the wishes of Pius IX. Whatever extended and strengthened the power of the Pope was, in Veuillot's opinion, the thing to be desired. He was not only a fanatical advocate for Papal despotism, but he seems conscious of no necessity whatever for limitations.

The strength of the opposition in France to the Papal schemes did but increase Veuillot's zeal for the fight. He was exactly in his element. Here was an enemy worthy of his steel. Ecclesiastics of distinction, men of learning and ability, Veuillot criticized with an air of superiority to which the French devout were unaccustomed.

They were a powerful contingent, those chiefs of the opposition in France. Cardinal Matthieu, Archbishop of Besançon; Darboy, Archbishop of Paris; Mgr. Ginoulhiac, the learned Bishop of Grenoble, thoroughly familiar with the principles of the primitive Church; Mgr. Dupanloup, the powerful and impassioned Bishop of Orleans; Mgr. Maret, the determined Gallican, perhaps the most learned of them all, of the school of Bossuet and the reforming councils; the priest Gratry, member of the Oratory; these were among the most distinguished adherents to the Ecclesiastical traditions of France. Nothing daunted

[1] P. de la Gorce, vol. ii. p. 159.

by name and fame, Veuillot arose to do battle against them all with the peculiar weapons whose deadly use he understood only too well.

Maret published his learned treatise on the traditional government of the Church, in which he balanced the authority of the collective episcopate against the centralized despotic papal power. Veuillot railed on this Bishop without a diocese, whose admission to the council would be rather by courtesy than by right.

Dupanloup issued his *Observations* which, as Veuillot correctly saw, while professing to show that the dogmatic definition would be inopportune, in reality raised objections of the most serious nature against the doctrine itself. Veuillot, accordingly, made the fiercest onslaught upon the Bishop of Orleans. Unfortunately, this onslaught stung the warm-hearted, impulsive Bishop, and he answered Veuillot in a furious letter, in which he did not hesitate to apply to the editor of the *Univers* an apocalyptic expression originally applied to Satan.[1] Veuillot is "the accuser of the brethren." It was an unfortunate reference. Country curés wrote letters of sympathy to the accuser of the brethren, while Veuillot replied that he was not under the Bishop's jurisdiction. Both were, no doubt, in deadly earnest. But earnestness displayed in exasperating raillery not unnaturally provoked the earnestness of a flashing indignation.

Louis Veuillot established himself at Rome for the whole seven months of the Vatican Council. This was done with the approval of Pius IX. Here the journalist held a singular position. A layman, without office, with no more right of entrance than any other man, he probably knew more about the inner workings of

[1] Rev. xii. 11.

the Council than almost any other person outside it. His house in Rome was thronged with people connected with the movement ; theologians, secretaries, partisans of the Ultramontanes, met, conversed, discussed from day to day in Veuillot's rooms, brought him the latest news, and kept him thoroughly well informed. Members of the Council streamed continually to his dinner-parties, and were on the most intimate terms with the powerful journalist. Veuillot's information was even more direct and authoritative still. He was in constant communication with the Pope through the papal secretaries who were authorized to instruct him in matters of great importance. The consequence was that the *Univers* possessed exceptional advantages and became, although independent and liable to be disowned, an almost official exponent of the movements in Rome.

Veuillot heard all the stories which circulated in Rome while the Council sat. The gossip and chatter of the backstairs all came within his hearing. It is very undignified, much of it, but most of it intensely human. And the modern historian has to take it all in account. For the modern historian, it has been said, takes his meals in the kitchen.

Veuillot heard remarks of the Pope about the Bishop of Orleans. Poor Dupanloup, said Pius ; it is the decapitated St. John who ought to be invoked for him, for he has lost his head. To Dupanloup's theologian Pius said, " I know that your Bishop is here, but I have not yet seen him."

Veuillot tells a story of a certain Cardinal Archbishop who implored the Pope not to allow the doctrine of his infallibility to be introduced into the Council's deliberations. It would alienate the Protestants, and

make reunion with the Greeks impossible. Were it passed the Cardinal Archbishop would be constrained to resign. Pius replied: "I, Jean Marie, believe in the Pope's infallibility. Do you think I am *assez bête* to order the Fathers of the Council to proclaim me infallible? No, no; the Holy Spirit will inspire them. They will act according to the light which they receive. You, my son, told me the very same thing about the Immaculate Conception. You have seen how the dogma has been proclaimed and accepted, and you did not give in your resignation. If you were so bad a prophet on the first occasion, what confidence can you have in yourself now?"[1]

The seven months of the Council were the most laborious of the journalist's career. Veuillot complains that he has not a moment for the art treasures of Rome. Within a stone's throw were the finest things in the world to be seen. But he has to turn away from them to study some passage in the Council of Ephesus bearing on the controversies of the hour. "Ouf! je crois que j'étais davantage né pour faire des sonnets."[2] He knew, however, that his lively paragraphs, his bold judgments, his epigrams, had the approval of the Pope and made him smile.[3] Nor was this from hearsay. Pius gave Veuillot private audience and expressly approved the line taken in the *Univers* against the Bishop of Orleans.[4]

How Veuillot treated Gratry is one of the best-known incidents in the journalist's career.

Gratry, as viewed by Veuillot and his school,[5] was acknowledged to have been a man of real merit and great personal charm, and a believer in the personal

[1] *L. Veuillot*, par Eugene Veuillot, iv. p. 81.
[2] p. 148. [3] p. 129. [4] p. 84. [5] p. 104.

infallibility of the Pope, until he joined the party of Dupanloup. The opposition induced him to believe that his intervention would have great weight in averting the dogma; and these persuasions, in Veuillot's opinion, turned his head. His talent as a writer, his vivacity, his reputation, were certain to ensure him many readers; and the Opposition acquired in him a valuable recruit. Veuillot says that he was not a man of solid and extensive learning, either in theology, or in canon law, or in ecclesiastical history. And, unfortunately, thanks to his fine style, and his incapacity for modern ideas, and his drawing-room metaphysics, Gratry was not without influence.

Veuillot's biographer attempts to excuse this style of criticism, on the ground that Gratry claimed to be Divinely commissioned to write, and accused the Roman liturgical books of systematic falsification. Whatever may be said for Veuillot's remarks, they were no answer to Gratry's historical criticisms. Gratry showed to demonstration that passages unfavourable to Papal claims had been deliberately left out. It was no answer to accuse him of drawing-room metaphysics.

But the biographer has omitted from his account some of the most virulent attacks which Veuillot made.[1]

Yet Veuillot could charge the Opposition with a monotonous succession of intrigues, hypocrisy, controversial injustices, falsification of statements, lying expositions, and perpetually renewed attempts to rouse the secular power against the liberties of the Church. "The Devil's part," says Veuillot, "was taken, as Pius had predicted; only it was taken on a larger scale than he had predicted."

[1] See *Roman Catholic Opposition to Papal Infallibility*, p. 181.

Meanwhile, as this biography itself attests, there was the Pope's incessant personal intervention in behalf of the dogma which he desired. He lavished approval on every Ultramontane writer. Pamphleteers against Maret, against Dupanloup, against Gratry, all received commendatory briefs. In these approving letters, Pius dealt scornfully with the Inopportunist plea. It was false wisdom to defer to the opinions of the day. It was a theory of blind guides. Wisdom could never be acquired but through the truth, and truth was what men should never falter in proclaiming.[1] As a criticism on the Inopportunist plea, this was undoubtedly effective. But Pius knew, as well as Veuillot, that the Inopportunist plea sheltered rejection of the infallible doctrine itself.

It was observable, also, that the Papal briefs were especially directed to priests whose Diocesans were of the Opposition. Pius sympathized with the difficulties of priests so placed, and supported them against the authority of their Bishops. The Pope openly thanks such priests for the earnestness with which they desired to see the prerogatives which Christ had granted to St. Peter and his successors more unmistakably defined.

The Benedictine, Guéranger, received a Papal Brief for his work on the Papal Monarchy ; praising not only its learning and doctrine, but also its militant spirit. "The opponents of Papal infallibility," said Pius, "were men who, while glorying in the name of Catholic, showed themselves to be saturated with corrupt principles, availing themselves of calumny and sophisms to lower the authority of the supreme head of the Church, of whose prerogatives they were afraid. They do not believe, as other Catholics do,

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

that the Council is governed by the Holy Spirit. They were full of audacity, folly, unreason, impudence, hatred, violence, etc. etc."

Certainly Pius did not conceal his intentions, nor withhold his influence.

The final proclamation of the Decree was made during the darkness of a violent thunderstorm. In Veuillot's view the Church was coming out of Egypt. They were on Sinai. The Church was being "de-pharaonized." It was escaping from the deleterious influence of the world. He expressed the joy of victory. "We leave the battlefield victorious," said a Bishop: "but," he added, "we leave our wounded."

With the close of the Council, Veuillot returned to Paris. The proclamation of Papal infallibility was quickly followed by the Franco-Prussian War, and the loss of the temporal power of the Pope. Veuillot was, of his own deliberate choice, shut in Paris during the Siege, after refusing the generous offer of a safe retreat elsewhere.

During the war, the *Univers* was carried on precariously, in reduced proportions, and under enormous difficulties; destined, however, to recover its old prestige when that period of horror was past.

During the Commune, Darboy, the Archbishop of Paris was shot upon the barricades. Veuillot characteristically records that between the Siege and his death the Archbishop of Paris had submitted to the decree of the Church which he had opposed.

Efforts were made in France to transfer the Bishop of Orleans to the Archbishopric of Paris. It would be his misfortune and ours, wrote Veuillot to Rome. Paris more than any diocese in the world, he continued, needs an apostolic man whose advent will rouse neither

apprehension nor enthusiasm. Veuillot's warning seems somewhat superfluous. Dupanloup was the very last that Rome was likely to approve as Archbishop of Paris. Darboy's successor was Guibert, who is said to have informed people that his principles were those of the *Univers*.

It is scarcely to be wondered that the *Univers* came into collision with authorities in the political sphere. In 1860, it was suspended for having maintained the rights of the Pope against Napoleon. It remained under this sentence seven years.

Even Pius, himself, did on one occasion rebuke the *Univers*. He said in a public speech that there were in France two parties: one which was afflicted with exaggerated fear of Papal influence; the other which forgot the laws of charity. Accordingly, he recommended humility to the one, and charity to the other. It was understood in France that the *Univers* was one of the subjects of the Pope's rebuke. Veuillot at once professed submission to the warning. Pius replied in a Brief that he had never rebuked the principles for which Veuillot contended, but only the manner in which he uttered them, and the frequent personalities which his writings contained, and which breathed a bitter zeal quite foreign to the spirit of Catholic charity.[1]

This was in 1872. Veuillot submitted and professed a penitent intention to amend. But he owned himself profoundly discouraged. He also sought and obtained permission to treat the Brief as a private letter, and apparently the document was not published until after his death.

This was considerate. But it is difficult to avoid the

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 347.

criticism that this rebuke of Veuillot's style was prompted by a desire to conciliate the Government of France. The regrettable fact remains that no such rebuke ever issued from Rome while Veuillot directed the same "bitter zeal" and virulent personalities against Bishops and Priests of the Church, whose sole offence consisted in their resistance to the infallibilist movement.

On two other occasions the *Univers* was suspended by the French Government on political grounds. The journal had long been displeasing to Bismarck.[1] Certainly nothing could well be more remote from the Prussian Statesman's religious opinions. But that it should have attracted his opposition is a remarkable tribute to its influence. German journalists are said to have called France the country of Veuillot. As a concession to German remonstrances the *Univers* was twice over suspended by the French authorities, once for two months, and again for fifteen days. All this greatly increased his favour in Rome. Veuillot was assured that his cause was identified with that of the Church. If Bismarck or the liberal Catholics were attacking the *Univers* they were in reality through him attacking the Church.

Veuillot survived many of the principal figures in these historic scenes. The year 1878 saw the death of several leaders. Victor Emmanuel died on January 8th, Pius IX. on February 7th. A little later Dupanloup followed them.

In Rome the Conclave was one of the briefest in history. The Cardinals entered on the evening of February 18th, and on the morning of February 20th, Cardinal Pecci was announced as Pope. Veuillot was

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 501.

soon able to secure himself an audience and to express his homage to Leo XIII.

When Pius IX. attained the twenty-fifth anniversary of his election, Veuillot had written in magnificent terms of the great work achieved during his tenure of the primacy. "Pius IX.," wrote Veuillot, "has reigned twenty-five years, ever faithful to God, and to human souls. He has created the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. He has built around the Church, around the Christian world, around the human soul, the rampart of infallibility. He has condemned every modern error, and has condemned it for ever."

Truly magnificent expressions. It would seem as if there remained but little for Leo XIII. to accomplish. He does not appear, however, to have found it so.

On the death of the great Bishop of Orleans, Veuillot for the last time arose to criticize his departed enemy.

The life of Mgr. Dupanloup, said Veuillot, was long and laborious, full of success from a worldly point of view, full also of reverses. He had exuberant zeal and activity. He defended, on certain matters, firmly and courageously the honour and the rights of the Church. But in Veuillot's opinion Dupanloup was far from being the model Bishop that his friends supposed. Neither as a teacher, nor as a politician, nor as a writer, could he win Veuillot's approval. He rose to some distinction in all the various pathways to renown: whether the Assembly, the Academy, the Pulpit, or the Press, or the Council, where he held the deplorable rôle of a party leader. After the Council his submission was honourable, but unfortunately belated. Throughout his life Dupanloup, in Veuillot's opinion, was "qu'un de ces passants remarquable qui n'arrivent pas." A

severe judgment this, certainly, as Veuillot's biographer confesses ; but excusable, he thinks, on the ground of Dupanloup's efforts for twenty-five years to crush the journal. However, to many minds, Veuillot's sentence appeared to be only another instance of that bitter zeal quite foreign to the spirit of Christian charity.

Veuillot felt compelled to write again in self-defence. What would have become, humanly speaking, of the Catholic Church, he asked, if the Bishop of Orleans, instead of being in the minority at the Vatican Council, had ruled the majority of the Bishops ? If, instead of being what Veuillot calls " paternally overruled " by Pius IX., Dupanloup had succeeded in overruling the Pope, the consequences would have been that : (1) the immense advantages of the Syllabus would have been postponed if not lost ; (2) the dogma of Infallibility would have been declared inopportune at the time when it was urgently necessary ; a time when all earthly sovereignties were failing ; and the world would have been left, according to Veuillot, without light and without hope ; (3) the reform of the Gallican liturgy would have been rejected, a reform to which Dupanloup was the last to submit ; (4) and finally, the liberal Catholic school would have triumphed in the Church.

Veuillot's biographer asks, Who can deny that all this is true ? If in other departments the Bishop of Orleans rendered great and glorious service to the Church ; if he defended the temporal power of the Papacy so fearlessly and insistently as to acquire the very reproach of fanaticism which the liberals would lay exclusively to the charge of the Ultramontanes ; if he carried on an eloquent and powerful campaign in behalf of Christian education ; yet, nevertheless, on the points enumerated by Louis Veuillot it is undeniable

that Dupanloup's principles and tendencies were opposed to those of the Papal authority. That the school of the Bishop of Orleans did not cause still more serious deviations from the aims of Pius IX. was largely due to the school of Veuillot and to the influence of the *Univers*.

Louis Veuillot died in 1883. His relinquishment of journalism after nearly fifty years' work is told in pathetic terms in a letter to his brother Eugene who was his constant collaborator, and to whom he bequeathed the responsibilities of *rédacteur en chef*.

Never was a literary man more fully identified with his work. He lived in the *Univers*. It was his creation. It satisfied his needs. He was evidently a generous man to his friends, affectionate and happy in domestic life. But his whole soul was in his journal. He was a bold journalist of exceptional power. His very defects and vulgarities increased his influence. Where the sustained elevation and refinement of a Montalembert left large classes comparatively unmoved, the merciless raillery, the graphic touches, the scathing sarcasm of Veuillot captivated and retained. He could descend to levels and to methods which Montalembert could not touch without conscious deterioration and loss of caste. That was Veuillot's weakness and also his strength.

A curious passage in Veuillot's will asks forgiveness of all men whom he may have offended or wronged. There was, he says, no shadow of personal resentment left. But he continues naïvely that three or four persons, perhaps a dozen, have really hated him. Some of them are still alive. Let them understand that they are wrong, and that he forgives them sincerely. He asks them, it is his last request, to pray

for him as he will pray for them, at the tomb of Pius IX.

The tomb of Pius IX. was hardly a tactfully named locality. It would scarcely bear the sound of conciliation to liberal Catholic ears. But this was Veuillot all over. He was probably serenely unconscious of the effect of his words on the sensitive Opposition. In controversy he was not over particular in the choice of his weapons. The object was not to convince his enemy but to win his cause.

"I am a Catholic," said Veuillot, "first and before all things, and I subordinate everything to my Catholic beliefs. The Church is my party and even my country."

This self-judgment is true. He did subordinate everything to his Catholic belief, even charity.

To judge from the biography before us the time has not yet come for impartial judgment on the actors in that critical and stormy period. A man's life written by his brother and completed by his nephew, both of whom are identified with the same journalistic interest and the same religious principles, is naturally apt to partake of the nature of a panegyric. And that is far too much the case in this interesting book.

We close the pages with the reflection that we could wish a cause to be defended in other ways. The methods of Veuillot were truly characterized by Pius IX. when he spoke of a bitter zeal which is foreign to the Christian spirit. He is a controversialist who may be, but ought not to be, regarded complacently so long as he is on your side. He may convince the already converted. But if anything is certain it is that this is not the method by which converts can be won.

V

GRATRY

GRATRY was born at Lille, in 1805. Neither his father nor his mother embraced any definite religion, but both exhibited a capacity for high ideals. Part of Gratry's early years were spent in Germany, where he heard a German woman observe that all Frenchmen were unclean beasts. The child (he was only seven) resolved that such blasphemer ought to die, and deliberately hurled down from an upper story a heavy weight, which if it had not miscarried must have killed her. The woman escaped with a shock and the boy with a whipping, but the incident was prophetic of the firmness of his controversial onslaughts as a man.

When Gratry was fifteen he was sent to Paris to the College Henri IV., where he lived in an atmosphere of irreligion and immorality which the masters themselves promoted. When the head of a school could give his pupil the advice, "I no more believe in these things than you do, but I recommend you to make your Easter Communion," the effect on morals as well as on religion can easily be imagined. Gratry's moral sense recoiled from the advice, and he declined to degrade a Sacrament to a social formality. But he could also say that he never spoke to a Christian for five whole years.

On the other side was the redeeming fact of his love for his mother: a love which he declares protected him

from the dangers of an immoral school atmosphere. Yet the state of things in the school appears to have been unsuspected outside. Even his parents realized nothing.

His intellectual growth was rapid. He had read Homer before he was twelve, and a miscellaneous ill-chosen mass of the literature of France. For years, he says, he thought in Latin, and composed Latin verses even in his sleep.

In his autobiographical fragments, the *Souvenirs de ma Jeunesse*, Gratry tells the story of his conversion to religious belief. It came in the period of adolescence, that period to which conversion seems frequently to belong. Many influences contributed toward the same. There were casual encounters with men of faith. There was a companion's example. There was a saintly priest. There was reaction from the general tone and standard of his little world. There was a seriousness of mind, not unmixed with melancholy, and strengthened by a consciousness of capacity for intellectual things. There were the affinities of a naturally religious disposition. There was the craving of the soul for the satisfaction of spiritual needs. Corresponding to these there was most evidently the call of the Lord, the inward and long-unrealized upward drawing of the Spirit.

So Gratry passed through a deep experience. He had a vision of reality. He pictured in his vivid imagination the innumerable multitude of average mortals who had passed, like sheep unconscious of their destiny, along the way from birth to death. The nothingness of life overwhelmed him. He cried aloud, "O God, explain to me the mystery. Make me to know the truth. I vow to dedicate my life to it."

So the young student found his way from Voltaire to the *Imitation of Christ.* That he should spend his time reading the latter brought down upon him his father's indignant reproaches. The elder had no patience with such pieties. But the son persevered. Thrown in upon himself precisely when most in need of support, he alternated between periods of hope and depression, experienced morbid fears so far as at times to think himself doomed to perdition. At last he made for the nearest church, and went to an unknown priest for confession. The priest delayed his absolution for several months. Gratry owns that this direction was wise. Meanwhile he yearned for reception of the Sacred Body of Christ.

He tells us how, in his untaught self-willed way, he rose from his bed one night, took bread, and, addressing to God a prayer full of faith, took upon himself to bless the bread, and asked God to give to that benediction all the efficacy which it might acquire. Then he consumed the bread in memory of the Saviour and in desire of Communion.[1] The act, he held, was not without its use. It was to Sacramental Communion as a vessel of silver is to a vessel of gold.

In due time he came to the reality. Reception of the Sacrament was, however, followed, to his dismay, by a violent reaction towards unbelief. A grievous storm of doubt and hesitation swept across his soul. But the storm was the prelude of peace. It passed ; and after many years he could write that unbelief had never invaded him again.

From that time he began to communicate every week. He made a silent vow that he would never marry. Like much else, he did this independently of

[1] *Souvenirs*, p. 81.

any human advice. He devoted hours a day to the study of religion and philosophy. He read the Scripture eagerly, having never read it as a child. He kept a private journal of his thoughts, which he wrote in Latin, and afterwards destroyed. Liable to fits of overwhelming depression, he found a parallel to himself in the Lamentations of Jeremiah. On the other hand, he saw ideal visions of a city of peace in which all the dwellers loved one another. This inspired him deeply.

At last, in the same independent spirit, he made abrupt decision. Consulting no one, he threw up his worldly prospects and resolved to become a priest, to his parents' disgust and dismay. In after years he looked back with astonishment on his own determination and energy. But God must be obeyed : he had no choice. Gratry refused to receive support from his father, whose hopes he had disappointed. Accordingly, with no possessions but a few books and clothes, he entered upon an unknown career.

Reception in a seminary for so intellectual a young student was not difficult. He passed the usual course and became a priest. He tells us how he disciplined himself to uncongenial tasks. He had taken an unaccountable dislike to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which seemed to him devoid of sense. He compelled himself to study it in the Vulgate and the Greek, and the unintelligible letter became to him a flood of light.

Gratry spent years after he became a priest as a schoolmaster. But administration was not his sphere. Nor was his interest in the work of a school. He had no power of discipline. He yearned for a studious calm, and groaned over the incessant distraction which exhausted his strength and absorbed his days. Always

frail and easily overwrought, the constant use of his voice brought on an affection of the throat from which he suffered all his life. In the midst of the work at school his imagination floated away over the youthful heads of his pupils, far into some region of abstract ideas, from which he was with difficulty recalled to the prosaic task of restoring discipline in the class before him. Certainly this was not the type to produce a successful trainer of the youthful mind. It is not surprising that Gratry made several transitions from one kind of school to another.

Then came an occasion which drew forth Gratry's controversial capacities. He was now a lecturer at the Ecole Normale, over which Vacherot presided. Vacherot was a person whose logical faculties were developed at the expense of his religion. He was at that time fascinated by the Hegelian dialectic. His cold and clear and logical temperament had scanty appreciation for the religious needs of human nature. He was above all things critical, and although the master of an admirably incisive style, strongly deprecated any approach to eloquence.

During the years 1844–1851 Vacherot published the three volumes of his critical history of the Alexandrian school. His real concern was with philosophy. But he could not avoid considering the relation of Neoplatonism to Christianity. He openly professed a profound regard for that religion, but frankly stated that his profound regard for it would not hinder the course of his investigations. When he came to face the development of Christianity he maintained that in the first three centuries the Christian religion constantly changed its form. But to win the world immutability of dogma was essential. This was obtained by Greek

philosophy. The early Councils sanctioned the conclusions of Christian thought which had been developed under philosophic influences. Vacherot recognized that the same Councils rejected doctrines contrary to the spirit of Christianity, and also eliminated rash speculations which, without being contrary to Christianity, belonged rather to philosophy than to religion. Yet he held that Greek philosophy developed Christianity and transformed it. He could not see that the development did but express the data of Christianity in the terminology of Greek thought. But, then, he considered that Christ taught no new doctrine. The metaphysics of religion, the profound doctrines about God and the Word, came either from Hebrew tradition or from Greek philosophy. He could not see that they were the implications of Christianity.[1]

He saw clearly that some of the early Fathers propounded ideas about God which were quite irreconcilable with the orthodox dogma of the Trinity as enacted by the Councils afterwards. And he drew the inference that truth was with the earlier imperfect utterance of individuals rather than with the later matured and collective formulas of the corporate institution. Yet, at the same time, he was able to say that, thanks to Greek thought, the Alexandrian Fathers converted the vague doctrine of Scripture concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, into a real theory. What he held amounted to saying that the Christian view was born at Jerusalem, matured at Alexandria, and formulated at Nicæa.[2]

There was much in all this which was profoundly disconcerting to Vacherot's Catholic contemporaries in

[1] *Histoire critique de l'École l'Alexandrie*, i. pp. 168–230.
[2] p. 296.

France. It was all written in a spirit of aloofness and detachment from religion, which suggested much more than it affirmed. It was taken to imply that Christianity was not a supernatural revelation, but only the product of mere unaided human intelligence. And the asserted contradiction between the original deposit and the matured result was, as Vacherot stated it, exceedingly serious.

By this very able work Vacherot rose suddenly into fame. It was felt in the archdiocese of Paris that some one must reply. Gratry accordingly undertook the task.

It was the misfortune of Gratry's mind that he had not realized that any theory of development was tenable.[1] His biographer says that Gratry was unacquainted with Newman's famous *Essay,* which was not translated into French until 1845. But Gratry might have found a theory of development in the theologian Petavius. Instead whereof he took Bossuet for his guide, and Bossuet was not adequate to nineteenth century requirements. He was quite unable to do justice to the elements of truth which Vacherot's exposition contained.

But the public effect was great. Gratry's reply to Vacherot caused much disturbance in the University. A public dispute between two of its professors was held to be a scandal, and in every way injurious to its interests. The consequence was that Vacherot was dismissed and Gratry resigned. They were, however, destined to come into controversial collision once again.

For some years past Gratry's imagination had been haunted by the ideal of a studious community of priests. He drew a beautiful picture of the strength

[1] Chauvin, p. 111.

acquired by mutual association in the same great cause, in an intellectual brotherhood devoted to the service of the Church, and the advancement of the Faith. By association the power of the individual is multiplied. Moreover, the institution so created tends to draw students from without, and to perpetuate movements beyond the limits of the life of the individual.

A similar longing for community life existed in many other French clergy about that time. After much thought and conference among friends, a scheme was matured for restoring to France the Oratorian Order of St. Philip Neri.

But the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, notwithstanding the irreproachable orthodoxy of its canonized founder, had in France the compromising associations of the Gallican and Jansenist. It was, therefore, thought advisable, while restoring the community, to lift it above any such suspicions. Accordingly, acting on advice from Rome, the new brotherhood was called the Oratory of the Immaculate Conception.

This little society of like-minded spirits included Pététot, formerly curé of Saint Roch, as superior, Gratry, Adolphe Perraud, and Charles Perraud, and above all, Henri Perreyve, whose character is so beautifully described in Gratry's life of him.

Before entering upon this work Gratry spent a year with Dupanloup, as Vicar-General of the diocese of Orleans. It was largely under the influence of Dupanloup's generous sympathy that the restoration of the Oratory was completed.

From the founding of the Oratory began Gratry's reputation as a preacher. He had none of the popular preacher's gifts. His voice was weak, and his delivery poor. He was very unequal in his treatment of a theme,

But his instructions, although simple and conversational, were full of imagination and poetic ideas, full of fire and moral earnestness, largely apologetic, and keenly alive to the prevalent tendencies of thought. Some came to hear him once and came no more. But from the crowd many were sifted out and retained. The Protestant Guizot, no less than de Broglie and Montalembert, were among his frequent hearers.

Gratry's poetic ideal of community life was found to be in painful contrast with the actual. Life does not begin with the realization of its ideals in the community any more than in the individual. Indeed, the latter case is the explanation of the former. It must be confessed that Gratry himself was in no small degree responsible for his disappointments. There were conflicting aims among the members. The superior had one object in view, and Gratry had another, and a very different one. As was natural, the superior, as a former parish priest, distinctly with a parochial mind, and a practical gift of administration, was not a student, and was bent on directing the community towards the extension of the Church's work by missions and labours of a practical kind. Gratry, on the other hand, as was equally natural to a studious being, aimed at the production of controversial and religious writings, which demanded continuous study uninterrupted by extraneous affairs. These were aims which the superior's intentions constantly upset. Gratry found his coadjutors in literary labours sent in all directions by the energies of the practically minded chief. This frustration of his ideals he very naturally deplored. Both alike were disconcerted by their conflict of aims. Their ideals were not necessarily exclusive. But they had not

thoroughly understood each other from the beginning. And while the superior was evidently large-hearted and well-intentioned, he had neither the power to include the two ideals, nor the capacity to preside over a purely studious institution.

But there was more than this. There were peculiarities in Gratry's character which made harmonious action difficult. He was one of those individuals for whom the regularity and restrictions essential to the well-being of a community were almost insupportable. He seemed unable to conform to the simplest rules of domestic discipline. Absorbed in his visions and his ideas, he would want to write when meals were waiting, and constantly broke away from social life to solitary meditation. Thus the student developed more and more into the recluse. Weak health and frequent illness increased the tendency to solitude. Hence his personal contribution to the common life of the brotherhood was scanty enough. The community appreciated him, quite realized his great ability, and made large concessions to his individuality. They let him have his meals apart. They assigned a special attendant to wait on him. But this isolation tended to diminish the corporate spirit. It put a strain on the resources and the patience of the brotherhood.

Thus the active and the contemplative type found it hard to coalesce. It is always the tendency, whether in a community or out of it. The organizer and the studious have each the defects of their qualities, and are easily deficient in mutual understanding. They tend each type to go his separate way.

So it happened in the Oratory at Paris. A crisis came at last, and it was unanimously agreed that " in

consideration of the immense services rendered to the congregation Gratry should be authorized to retire from the community, and to live apart while retaining the title of Oratorian."

One or two of the more studiously disposed followed Gratry into his literary labours. But the community pursued its more active ministrations.

These were the years of Gratry's best intellectual efforts. Between 1852 and 1860 he produced his best-known works, the *Connaissance de Dieu,* and the *Connaissance de l'Ame.*[1]

Gratry's *Connaissance de Dieu* is an effort to establish a logical demonstration of Deity. The age has lost its confidence in reason. Gratry complains that few reasonable beings cultivate the sacred gift of reason. The vast majority of men cultivate the ground. The rest cultivate nothing. Nor does Gratry himself experience much satisfaction in the department of metaphysics. Years are passing and death approaches. The trials of life, the sufferings of the world, appeal constantly to the heart in the midst of his speculations, and seem to endorse the reproaches of his friends: "Why should you, a priest, devote your life to metaphysics and subtle research? What interest have these things for those who suffer, above all, those who die?" Well, replied Gratry, he longed to recover, if it might be so, certain deluded minds. And then he would concern himself with abstractions no longer. He wanted to devote himself to nothing but morals and religion. Meanwhile he gives ideas on God derived from Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas, Descartes, Pascal, Malebranche, Fénelon, Petavius and Thomassin, Bossuet and Leibnitz.

[1] Chauvin, p. 179.

But Gratry was not profound as a metaphysician. Nor does he show in these two volumes any conception of the nature of rigorous proof. The value of the work consists in its religious beauty and depth of faith. It is a deeply spiritual mind, glowing, fervid, imaginative, full of piety. But clear argument, not to speak of demonstration, there is none.

The great ambition of Gratry's life was the reconciliation of science, philosophy, and religion. He felt profoundly the disastrous consequences of discord between them. The time must come when Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim. These were the days when the Hegelian logic was in the height of its popularity. And to Gratry the Hegelian logic was the enemy. Accordingly, he produced a volume entitled *Logic*, in which he propounded his theory of the relation between the three departments of human study, physical science, mathematics, and philosophy.

He argued that the method of procedure in all these three departments was the same. In every case it was nothing else than induction ; that is to say, an advance from the finite to the infinite. Every movement of human thought, whether reluctantly or otherwise, whether consciously or not, is a movement from the finite to the infinite, from nature to God. This was Gratry's solution of the discord between the departments of human life. And this theory he expounded with extraordinary grace and delicacy of style, with glowing imagination, and amid vivid illustrations borrowed from mathematics or from science.

But Gratry's logic met with the severest criticism even from the apologists of religious faith. He failed to convince them that the reconciliation greatly to be

desired was in reality achieved. One of the very ablest French religious thinkers, Emile Saisset, whose brilliant *Essai de Philosophie Religieuse* (1812), was translated into English under the title of *Modern Pantheism*, and whose powers of clear analysis and exposition were almost unsurpassed, devoted himself to a refutation of Gratry's work.

Saisset acknowledged that Gratry accurately appreciated the requirements of the age.[1] Gratry himself had doubted and suffered. Gratry was full of enthusiasm, candour, and faith. His learning, without being profound or precise, was extensive and varied. His style recalled at times the pages of Fénelon. But as a philosophic effort Gratry's work rested on an insecure foundation.

Induction consists in nothing else than in passing from experiment and observation to a knowledge of the laws of nature, which are nothing else than the constant relations between the phenomena of the universe.

What possible resemblance can there be between this procedure and the speculations of philosophers on the existence and attributes of God ? The metaphysical procedure is a transition from the changeful, the temporal, and the limited, to the immutable, the eternal, and the infinite. It is a passage from contingent existence to necessary existence. Science seeks the laws of nature, metaphysics seeks God and His attributes. But the laws of nature are the contingent facts. They might conceivably exist or not. They have in themselves nothing essential or absolute. Thus science and induction do not escape beyond the sphere of the normal and of the contingent.

[1] See Saisset, *Mélanges d'Histoire* (1859).

Saisset concludes that Gratry's identification of the religious method with the scientific is one of the most astonishing confusions that a Churchman could perpetrate. The criticisms even of Gratry's friends consisted, said Saisset, in praising his abilities and rejecting his conclusions.

In 1869 Vacherot reappeared in the literary world with another work, *On Religion*.

Vacherot's religious opinions had considerably developed by this time. His sceptical tendencies had matured. He now openly asserted what his opponents had suspected before. He no longer felt the same confidence in the philosophy of Hegel. Did not Hegel commend the doctrine of the Trinity? Vacherot's new book was written to affirm the irreconcilable contradictions between philosophy and religion, and to predict that in the long run all religion must expire as science became understood. That was his text.

He passed in review the leading French philosophic teachers of his day. He freely criticized even the distinguished and imposing figure of Victor Cousin, who blended philosophy and religion together, endeavouring to ascribe to each a necessary place.[1] In Vacherot's opinion, however, intuition and demonstration cannot dwell together permanently. The philosophic stage will expel the religious. There only remains respect for the intuitions of our youth. But faith must vanish, and religion strictly so called with it.

Vacherot proceeds to criticize the theological school in France with great freedom, not exempt from personalities. He has much to say on the illusions of orthodox theologians. But he does not deny their influence. In fact, if eloquence, talent, and passion

[1] p. 37.

are to decide the victory between criticism and tradition, Vacherot fears that it will fare badly with the critics.[1] He acknowledges that the Catholic writers and preachers are a remarkable array. They are an honour not only to the Church of France, but also to the literature of the age.[2] He enumerates among others Lacordaire, Dupanloup, Maret, Freppel, Perreyve, Hyacinthe, Félix, Darboy, Gratry.

Darboy is a refined and highly cultivated intellect, capable of theological and metaphysical discussions, but his tendencies are towards practical affairs and administration. Hyacinthe, in the pulpit of Notre-Dame, before the *élite* of Parisian society, develops orthodox ideas with remarkable imagination and a certain logical power.[3] Dupanloup belongs to a theological age less favourable to novelties. He has the faith and courage and passion of a doctor of the school of Joseph de Maistre. He does not hesitate to defend the Pope and his encyclicals.[4]

Then Vacherot draws a sketch of his old opponent Gratry. Gratry is more a theologian than a moralist. He understands controversy better than he does systematic instruction. He knows his authors, and employs them cleverly. He is a theologian of the family of Tertullian rather than of that of Malebranche: a comparison more true than agreeable. The ferocious passion of Tertullian was not less marked than his great ability. Gratry conceives everything with imagination, and judges everything in an impassioned way. He is a writer who has nothing ordinary in his ways of thought and speech: a doubtful compliment. Gratry's books are conspicuous for beauty of form, elevation of sentiment, theology mingled with scholastic

[1] p. 128. [2] p. 135. [3] p. 136. [4] p. 138.

formulas, mystic tendencies, and scientific illustrations in which the Church must sometimes find it hard to recognize its own doctrine. Vacherot admits that Gratry was able to set right some inaccuracies of the author of *The Critical History of the Alexandrian School*, and of the author of the *Vie de Jésus*; but contends that Gratry was not able to invalidate the main thesis of these two writers. But Gratry ought not to have called his opponents Sophists. That is to give a misapplication to an ill-sounding name. Gratry ought to know its historic use.[1]

Thus the theological school has its men of marked abilities. But Vacherot is sure that they will not succeed. He challenges Dupanloup, the Archbishop of Paris, and Gratry, whether they really think that their eloquence has settled the scientific movement of the age. Criticism is not disturbed either by the eloquence or the passion of its opponents. Catholics must turn to something more serious than brilliant and facile rhetoric. They must cultivate laborious researches and the careful examination of texts.[2]

Vacherot then proceeds to a criticism of religion, first on historical and then on psychological grounds.[3]

History led Vacherot away from faith. The inference which he drew from the numerous varieties of religion was adverse to the truth of any religion in particular. The result of a comparative study of religions was, in his opinion, unfavourable to faith.[4]

Vacherot held that while the historian can find ground to predict for Christianity a considerable duration, he cannot promise that this great religion will last for ever. He cannot promise such duration to any religion, nor, indeed, to the religious sentiment.

[1] p. 140. [2] p. 149. [3] p. 167 ff. [4] p. 172.

It is only psychology which can determine such a question as that.[1]

Accordingly, Vacherot turns from history to psychology, from observations to experiences.[2] There are the phenomena of doubt.

After referring to the experiences of Pascal and others, Vacherot describes his own. He says that when his faith evaporated it did not leave a blank. His natural tendency was towards abstract ideas. Deism remained. This is the usual case with minds "emancipated from Christian tradition."[3] It was the doctrine of the spiritualist school in which Vacherot was trained. Thus Vacherot believed in the objective reality of finite beings, and in the laws of Nature, and in the reality of the Infinite, the Absolute. But he considered all so-called revelation to be purely natural.[4] In Vacherot's opinion the transition from religion to philosophy may be, and often is, made without any sense of loss. At the same time, the transition should not be abruptly and hastily made. Otherwise there is danger of reaction and relapse. But to make the transition appears to him a mark of independence, strength, and intellectual force. To believe the same thing as our fathers and masters is pleasant and the easiest of all natural courses to take. To think for oneself is another matter. To do that is hard and contrary to nature. It is almost heroic: a thing of which very few intelligences are capable.[5]

Vacherot appears to apply his maxim to the sceptical son of a believing father, but not to the believing son of a sceptical father. It would be interesting to have his view of a maxim which clearly works both ways.

Gratry felt called upon to answer Vacherot a second

[1] p. 194. [2] p. 199. [3] p. 236. [4] p. 240. [5] p. 247.

time. The answer appeared in Gratry's *Letters on Religion.* He had no difficulty in showing that Vacherot's knowledge of the Gospels which he criticized was shallow and inaccurate. Also that Vacherot was still under the dominion of Pantheistic philosophy. Vacherot had asserted that the Christian morality was imperfect, and therefore must have its day. What particularly exasperated Gratry was Vacherot's contemptuous estimate of the Christian idea of woman,[1] and, in particular, Vacherot's assertion that the Church degraded woman to the level of an inferior being.[2] Vacherot's evidence for this was given in the somewhat airy remark, "See the Collections of the Councils, and especially that of Trent." This was equivalent to settling a point of scholarship by a reference to classical literature in general. Gratry answers by giving illustrations of the ascendancy of abbesses in the Middle Ages over communities not only of women but also of men.

Vacherot's scepticism was, according to Gratry, of the head and not of the heart; for his heart was devoted to ideals whose justification demanded God.[3] Yet his intellect impelled him to predict the extinction of religion, since in his opinion there was, in the religious sense, no such being as God.[4]

As to Vacherot's view that science is the irreconcilable enemy of religion, Gratry puts a totally different construction on the facts. He faces what he calls the disgraceful trial of Galileo.[5] But he claims that this was not in reality a conflict between theology and science. Strictly speaking, it was the error of seven Cardinals who were ignorant of astronomy and

[1] p. 85. [2] p. 89. [3] p. 115.
[4] pp. 117, 118. [5] p. 156.

erroneous in the application of the principles of theology. It was the faulty decision of a fallible tribunal which the Church, that is the Pope, has since corrected. The fault consisted in ignoring the maxim of St. Thomas that when a meaning ascribed to a Scripture text has been proved to be erroneous, that meaning ought no longer to be maintained. Now, the text in Joshua about the sun standing still is equally capable of two meanings. Since Galileo had proved the literal meaning to be mistaken, it ought to have been given up.[1] So Gratry. This is not the usual Roman apology for the incident. It certainly left something further for Vacherot to criticize.

Gratry attempted far too much. He attempted to summarize Biblical criticism, historical study, moral science, physical science, and psychology, each in a separate letter, and to show that every department refuted Vacherot's claim. It was only to be expected that a programme so ambitious should be very unequally and inadequately carried out. It became diffuse, and somewhat lost in generalities, which, however true and appealing to those who already believed, were hardly likely to be of much assistance in paving the way to faith, or in answer to the criticisms of Vacherot. The two men represented two contrasted types. The one coldly critical, distrustful of impulse and emotion ; the other mystical to the very core of his nature, a man of intense belief, quick to detect the weak points and inconsistencies of the colder mind, but not so quick to realize the strength of it, nor enough of a philosopher to criticize with real power the system of thought to which he found himself opposed.

But that which brought Gratry into European

[1] p. 158.

notice was his opposition to the doctrine of Papal infallibility. It may be that it is this by which he will be chiefly remembered in history. When rumours arose that the real purpose of the Vatican Council was nothing else than the erection of this doctrine into a dogma of the Faith, Gratry girded himself unto the battle against it. It has been often asked why the doctrine provoked his resistance, seeing that in his well-known book *De la Connaissance de Dieu* he had in successive editions affirmed that "almost all Catholics believe, and all admit in practice that the Sovereign Pontiff, deciding *ex cathedrâ* in matters of faith or morals, is infallible." But it should not be omitted that he went on to observe that "the Church, nevertheless, has not defined this point as an article of faith."[1] Moreover, he had taught that "the Church, whether dispersed or assembled in general Councils, is infallible."

It seems, then, really clear that Gratry's personal belief was the traditional belief of the Church in France. For him it was the Church which could not err, and not the Pope. He stated as a fact of history what the generality believed or acquiesced in practically: but he did not identify himself with that belief. He wrote ten years or more before the Vatican Council was called, and when no cloud on the horizon gave suspicion as yet of the coming storm. Like Dupanloup, he deplored the promotion of this opinion into the ranks of dogmatic obligation.

It has often been said of him that he was no theologian, and no historian, and devoid of knowledge in the details of the controversy. But, at any rate, he knew as much as many distinguished defenders of the

[1] *Connaissance de Dieu*, ii. p. 441.

doctrine, and his letters remain to witness that the subject must have been a long and careful study. It was, in fact, impossible for a studious French priest, with Gallican predilections, not to know the main objections to the doctrine of papal infallibility. It is also true that Gratry's famous four letters are one of the most brilliant critical contributions of the controversy of that excited period.

VI

EMILE OLLIVIER

THE history of the nineteenth century in France is covered by three writers. The seven volumes of Thureau-Dangin's *Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet* give the monarchy of Louis Philippe, 1830–1848. Emile Ollivier's *L'Empire Libéral* continues the story in the monarchy of Napoleon III., 1848–1871 (16 vols.), to which another volume has been added. And finally the story is completed by Gabriel Hanoteaux, in the four volumes of his *Contemporary France*, 1870–1900.

The sixteen volumes of Emile Ollivier's *L'Empire Libéral* are indispensable to the student of French history in the second half of the nineteenth century. Ollivier had many qualifications for such a work. He was not only familiar with the leading personages both of France and of Europe, and personally implicated in the course of international events during the years that he was at the head of the French Government, but also he had ample leisure for literary labours after the fall of the Empire in 1870. The drawback is that his work is apologetic rather than strictly historical. He writes in self-defence against the critics of his political career. No man has been more sharply criticized in his own country than the statesman who engaged in the responsibility of the disastrous Franco-Prussian War. But this does but add to the human

interest of the narrative. Ollivier is diffuse and discursive to a degree. But he had an excellent memory, a vivid imagination, much insight into human nature, and a capacity for brilliant summaries of character. And the story which he has to tell of the last and short-lived phase of kingship in France, from the *coup d'état* of 1848 to the overthrow in 1870, is exceedingly attractive and compelling. All sorts of personages, priests, literary men, politicians, soldiers, kings, crowd his pages. And Ollivier has a keen eye to the tragedy of human life with which he was profoundly familiar alike in his own experience and in the world around him. Add to this that he was religious, but not ultramontane ; sympathetic with the spiritual interests of his day ; distinctly modern, yet with a deep sense of the value of the past ; a careful student of great principles ; a man of comprehensive grasp and remarkably wide knowledge outside the political sphere : and you have certainly conditions which give peculiar importance to his literary work.

Ollivier's primary object is, of course, to tell the tale of Empire. But in so doing he tells also much of the great movements of religion, and throws a flood of light on the Church in France, on the experiences of the Roman See, on the dogmatic developments which issued in the Vatican Decrees, on the temporal government of the Pope, and on the relations between Church and State in the nineteenth century.

Ollivier was appropriately the historian of the temporal power of the Papacy. More than any other statesman he was concerned in its final stages. For France had taken the States of the Church under its protection. And that protection alone secured for the temporal power a precarious existence. When the

spirit of Nationality took possession of the Italian people, conflict with the Pope became inevitable. Pius IX. himself exhibited liberal sympathies at the time of his accession. He attempted reforms in the management of the Papal States. He incorporated a certain lay element into a government of priests. He made conciliating overtures towards the Nationalists of Italy. But the turning-point came in the assassination of his minister, Rossi, by the Democrats in Rome. Full of righteous indignation and disgust at this iniquitous deed, Pius revolted from liberalism and all its advocates. From that time forward he was stubbornly and resolutely at the other extreme. He fled from the city and took refuge elsewhere from Italian violence. In 1849 Napoleon III. took Rome, and Pius was reinstated. But he was only secured by the French occupation of the city. The management of the much-reduced Papal States was left in the hands of three Cardinals, who restored obsolete police methods, re-opened the Inquisition, and generally conducted judicial procedures, says Ollivier, on mediæval lines.[1] The French found themselves protecting in Rome a system of severity against which they protested in every other country in which it existed. This provoked deep discontent in Paris. The Nuncio was warned to take care, because Rome was playing with fire. The Pope's reply was not reassuring to France. "You French," he said, "are always in a hurry. Give us time." But it was more than time that Pius IX. required. Nothing less than the overthrow of the Pope's royal power would have satisfied the advocates of the political unity of Italy. Nor was Pius disposed to conciliation any more. The memory of his liberal overtures

[1] *L'Empire Liberal*, ii. 247.

haunted him. The Papacy at a distance from Rome can adapt itself to any form of government. But in Rome it could be nothing else than a theocracy, with which political freedom is incompatible.[1] In 1851 Antonelli, as Secretary of State, attempted to form a ministry of which the majority should be laymen. But the effort was futile. No liberal dared accept office, for fear of the daggers of Mazzini's followers. The selected laymen were nothing more than subservient echoes of the Papal Secretary of State.[2]

If the action of the Papacy toward the outer world was vigorous and enlightened, it was not so in the government of its own temporal domains. It concerned itself far more with the world than with the Papal States.[3] Thiers said that the Papal provinces were the worst administered in Europe. Metternich declared that the Pontifical government was one of the most incapable. The disorder prevalent in some of its provinces was chiefly its own fault, and still more due to the incapacity of its agents. "I cannot understand," he wrote, "how a Protestant becomes a Catholic in Rome." He compared Rome to a magnificent theatre with very poor actors. "Keep this remark to yourself," he added; "for I value too highly religion and its advancement to wish to weaken it in any way."

Ollivier says that Cardinal Sala wrote a memoir of Pius VII., which was suppressed as soon as it appeared. Sala confessed that the only way to save the temporal power of the Pope was to secularize it thoroughly.[4]

If this was the language of its defenders, it is easy to imagine that of its enemies.

The election of Pius IX. was itself a protest by the College of Cardinals against the existing state of

[1] p. 252. [2] p. 334. [3] T. iv. p. 301. [4] p. 306.

affairs. But, asks Ollivier, what was the result? Never was Pontiff a better man, or better intentioned. His example demonstrates more clearly than all arguments the impossibility of harmonizing the temporal power of the Pope with the maxims of modern times.

No State, says Ollivier, had such an assembly of distinguished minds as this Government of the Papal States with its Cardinals and Prelates and chiefs of Religious Orders. Yet it failed. And its failure was inherent in the very nature of the case. For the very purpose of the Pope's temporal power was to secure his spiritual independence.[1] Consequently, he could not subject himself to parliamentary control. Ollivier acknowledges that there were good laws in the Papal States. But the Pope, accustomed in his spiritual capacity to dispense with canons by his supreme authority, could not subject himself to obedience in his temporal capacity, or forego the power of dispensation.[2]

Least of all men could Pius IX. make such surrender. For he was nothing if not despotic. Ollivier holds that the notion that Cardinal Antonelli directed Pius is a fiction; it was Pius who overruled Antonelli. Once the President of the Committee on Finance, Cardinal Savelli, protested in Council against the expenses ordered by the Pope independently of the Committee's approval. Pius silenced him in the meeting and dismissed him afterwards.[3] Ollivier ascribes this arbitrariness to the flattery of the French Bishops. The smoke of the incense of flattery offered before the Pope by the majority of the Bishops of France had so clouded the atmosphere round the Papal throne, that

[1] p. 309. [2] p. 310. [3] p. 324.

Pius attended to nothing which was not laudatory or deferential.

The French Emperor himself wrote to Pius, advising the Pope to abandon his claim to the provinces which had revolted, and to demand from the Powers the assured possession of the rest.[1] This compromise Pius emphatically refused, on the ground that he could not do it without violating his oaths, and enfeebling the rights of all princes in the Christian world. He declared himself ready to face the severest experiences, and even to lose his life, in order to maintain inviolate the temporal possessions of the Roman Church and to guarantee the just rights of other princes.

Thus, says Ollivier, the struggle was in the temporal order far more than in the spiritual. It was the Sovereign, not the Pontiff, who appears in this contest; defending himself by opposing the principle of legal right to that of nationality.

Meanwhile French Bishops rallied to the Pope's support. Pie of Poitiers and Dupanloup of Orleans both attacked the Emperor.[2] More moderate Prelates, recognizing how much religion owed to the Emperor, refused to join the outcry. But thereby they incurred suspicion and denunciation from the Papalists. The majority sided with Dupanloup and Pie.

Among distinguished laymen Victor Cousin supported the Pope.[3] Ollivier explains the reason why Cousin was at the time in strained relations with Pius IX. The philosopher had published, in 1853, his Lectures on the True, the Beautiful, and the Good. The book was one of marked distinction: clear, brilliant exposition of spiritualist ideas. It met with much favour among Catholics. Lacordaire said that it did not

[1] p. 349. [2] p. 358. [3] p. 360.

contain a line at which Christianity need take offence. In his opinion the book was admirable and religious. But, says Ollivier, Mgr. Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, together with other fanatics, delated it to Rome, with a petition to have it placed upon the Index. One day, Mgr. Sibour informed the author that the Congregation of the Index had condemned his work. Cousin wrote to the Pope, declaring that he had meant well to religion, and that if anything in his book distressed the Pope it should be cancelled as soon as it was pointed out to him. Lacordaire still persisted that if he were in Cousin's place he would not retract a single line.[1] But Pius demanded from Cousin a profession of faith in the traditional dogmas of the Church and especially of the Incarnation.[2] Cousin sent no orthodox profession and retracted nothing. But he sent a letter which took effect.[3] In this he said that if there was a book universally respected it was the Meditations of Descartes. Yet the Congregation of the Index had condemned it until it was corrected. If the Congregation put Cousin's book on the list containing the Meditations, they would only be placing one of the humblest disciples of Descartes by the side of his master.

Upon receipt of this letter Pius ordered the Congregation of the Index to postpone action indefinitely. Accordingly, says Ollivier, Victor Cousin now testified his gratitude and supported Pius on the question of the temporal power.

But whatever support the philosopher might give could hardly alter the problem, much less solve it. The Pope as a secular prince had no less rights than any other monarch, but he had no more. He was

[1] T. iv. p. 360. [2] p. 361. [3] p. 362.

subject to the same vicissitudes as any other secular ruler.

The question of the temporal power of the Pope came before the French Chamber for discussion in 1860.[1] According to Ollivier, the feeling of the majority was in behalf of its maintenance. It was argued that the union of the temporal and the spiritual was supported by the traditions of the greatest nations. Why should any one object to a union of powers in Pius IX. which was considered reasonable in Queen Victoria? The Emperor of the French, as head of a Catholic nation, was right in protecting the Pope's temporal power. But it was also his duty to insist that the Holy See gave wise institutions and good government. For if France was Catholic, it was also liberal. When it took in one hand the cause of religion, it took in the other the cause of liberty. France could not separate these two causes in its dealings with Italy. Accordingly, it was strongly urged that the House should not hinder the Emperor in dealing with this double duty.[2]

Rome was greatly dissatisfied with the moderation of some of its own defenders. Morlot, Archbishop of Paris, was Grand Almoner of France, appointed by the Emperor in 1860. He was a man of calm, deliberate judgment and well-balanced mind. He supported the Papal cause before the Emperor with the authority which his moderation and his character inspired. But he declined to range himself with extremists like Dupanloup and Pie. Consequently, says Ollivier, the fanatical supporters of the Holy See were highly discontented with him.[3] Rome also showed signs of its displeasure. It was suggested that Morlot should

[1] p. 365. [2] T. v. p. 11. [3] p. 12.

resign his place as almoner. Morlot wrote to Rome to say that he would gladly do so, but that if he did he should resign at the same time his Archbishopric and his Cardinalship. Rome felt that this complete resignation of office would be too serious, and withdrew its demands.[1] Meanwhile Mgr. Pie got into trouble with the authorities of the State, and was condemned for comparing the attitude of the Emperor towards the Pope with that of Pontius Pilate towards Christ.[2]

Again, the French Emperor counselled Pius IX. to come to terms on the temporal power,[3] but again unsuccessfully. The advice reached Pius at an unpropitious time. For the very hour when the French Emperor counselled compromise was the hour in which enthusiastic Bishops, summoned to Rome for a great function, were surrounding the Pope with fervent professions of belief in his temporal rights. Cardinal Mattei, Dean of the College of Cardinals, addressed Pius, in the name of the Episcopate, in the most glowing terms and with majestic titles. "You are for us," said the Cardinal, "the Master of sound doctrine: you are the Centre of unity. You are for all peoples the indefectible Light prepared by the Divine Wisdom itself. You are the Rock, the Foundation of the Church itself. When you decree it is Jesus Christ Whom we obey." The speaker went on to declare that the temporal power was a necessity and a providential creation.[4]

Outside the atmosphere of the Vatican a very shrewd and discerning analysis of the situation in Italy was made by a member of the French Embassy, Count Lallemand.[5] He predicted that, however

[1] p. 117. [2] p. 161. [3] p. 471.
[4] p. 374. [5] T. vii. p. 131.

excellent the Pope's reforms in the management of the Papal States might be, they would never prevent the political union of Italy, with Rome for the capital. It was the Pontifical Government itself which was the object of attack, apart from any special defects or results of it. The reforms which the Pope had made were chiefly important as furnishing a reasonable pretext for the continued occupation of Italy by France. But the Pope was not disposed for reforms. His government was becoming more and more absolute in the spiritual sphere, and more and more personal in the political.

Up to the time at which Lallemand was writing, it had been a privilege of the Cardinals to demand audience of the Pope at any hour without previous notice. Now they were obliged to send a written notice. Hence if the College elects the Pope, it no longer advises him. Cardinals, said Lallemand, are no more than clerics robed in purple, confined to purely ecclesiastical functions, or to such civil functions as allow them no initiative or independence. They are correct in doctrine rather than fervent in faith ; men of elevation and *finesse*, but not with such breadth of view as ought to exist in princes of the Church.[1]

Meanwhile the Italian statesman made overtures to induce Napoleon to withdraw the French protection from Rome. The Emperor replied that he was anxious to withdraw, provided that such withdrawal would not have as its immediate result the downfall of the Pope's temporal power. He could not let French Catholics accuse their Government with deliberately handing over the Papacy to its enemies.

Napoleon's reply to the unionists of Italy shows in

[1] p. 133.

the clearest light his motives and his difficulties. It may be that the maintenance of the temporal power at Rome was among his personal religious ideals. It was certainly conceived by him as demanded by the Catholics of France. The opinion of many historians since has been that this necessity was a disaster for himself and his country. For Napoleon thereby alienated Italy, and through Italy Austria also. And when the Franco-Prussian War broke out, he had forfeited the support which might have prevented the loss of Alsace and Lorraine.

Ollivier entirely repudiates this interpretation of events. But whether Ollivier would have supported the Pope's kingly power as he did if it had not been for the Emperor's determination, is open to question. All through the volumes of this attractive history Ollivier has no real solution to give of the problem between the claims of Italian nationality and the claims of Papal tenure and immemorial possession. He thinks that the conflict might have been determined otherwise and Turin become the capital, leaving Rome to the Pope.

In the midst of all this suspense and perplexity on the temporal power, Pius IX. thought it his duty to neutralize the liberal element in the Church by a strong restatement of mediæval principles. The liberal school was popular and powerful, and had its leaders in such men as Montalembert, whose theories of the relation of Church and State at the Congress of Malines in 1863 caused sensation and dismay in the Roman ranks.

On December 8, 1864, Pius threw out his Encyclical with the Syllabus attached. This was a systematic and highly technical catalogue of errors condemned

by the Holy See.[1] It was sent to all the Bishops of the Roman obedience.

The Syllabus, says Ollivier, is the summary of the system which up to 1789 had ruled the relations between Church and State. The two societies were distinct but not separate. The Catholic Religion was the religion of the State. The honour of God was protected by civil penalties like that of the prince. A book condemned in Rome was burnt by the public executioner in Paris. Resistance to a Papal Bull was punished as a revolt against the fundamental laws of the State. If any person escaped from the cloister he was brought back by military force.[2]

The King was the secular arm of the Church. He had the Papal Bulls examined by his Parliament before they could be made obligatory in his kingdom. He only endorsed those which were judged consistent with public safety. Hence conflicts arose between the two Powers. The ultramontane theologians endeavoured to minimize the royal control; the Parliaments to extend it. Between this double fire the Bishops tried to secure for the Pope more than the Parliaments allowed, and for the King more than the Roman theologians conceded.[3]

The French Revolution swept this order of things away. It deprived the Church of its ascendancy. It laicized the State.

The Syllabus vindicated the old principles. Theoretically regarded, says Ollivier, there is no objection to be made against the affirmations of the Syllabus. No religion can permit freedom to teach what it condemns. Nor can it allow that a State should exist independent of its moral influence, or rebellious against

[1] T. vii. p. 194. [2] p. 201. [3] p. 202.

its doctrines. If it tolerated this it would not be believing. Dogmatic intolerance is a proof that a religion believes in itself.[1]

But, nevertheless, religions are compelled to take account of existing facts. The Concordat of Pius VII. was a practical recognition of the effects of the Revolution. The Curia allied itself with laicized States; with States which accepted what the Papacy repudiated.

Nevertheless, the Roman Church, in spite of these concessions of existing circumstances, maintained its abstract principles unchanged.[2]

This is what is technically called the distinction between the thesis and the hypothesis; between the theoretical principle and the circumstances of a particular time and place. Apparently this means that theoretically the Roman Church claims to possess coercive power, and presumably all the rights of the Inquisition, although practically it would not dream of attempting their exercise under existing conditions.

According to Ollivier, the technical form of the Syllabus made misconception by the laity easy. Violent attacks were naturally made upon it. The French Government requested an explanation from Cardinal Antonelli. The Cardinal Secretary of State replied, expressing astonishment that the Emperor, who represented conservative ideas, did not realize the conservative character of the doctrines propounded. He gave his word of honour that there was not the slightest political motive in the Syllabus. The French Ministry, however, prohibited its publication.[3] Dupanloup, in a famous pamphlet, commended it to the nation. However, in spite of explanations, says

[1] p. 203. [2] p. 204. [3] p. 216.

Ollivier, there was a radical opposition between the Syllabus and the principles upon which modern institutions are based.[1]

After the publication of the Syllabus, liberal Catholics, while nominally submitting, continued to act as if the Pope had not spoken. They slightly modified the form of their expressions, but they still maintained the principle of liberty, and to their last hours continued, on Lacordaire's maxim, penitent Catholics and impenitent liberals.[2]

The Encyclical and the Syllabus were subjected to very severe Parliamentary criticism in France. Strong protests were made against ultramontane usurpations. Cardinal Bonnechose, who supported ultramontanism and demanded reform of French law in the interests of larger Papal freedom, distinguished himself further by a maxim which the French clergy never forgave. He said that no general would allow disobedience among the soldiers under his command. "Every one of us Bishops commands a regiment. We say march, and they march."[3]

Archbishop Darboy, on the contrary, seized the opportunity to attack the Jesuits. He declared that they had no canonical existence in France. His grievance was that they pervaded his diocese without being subject to his jurisdiction.[4]

Ollivier reminded the Senate that the temporal power of the Pope was not an article of faith, and was therefore on Catholic principles open to discussion. Whether that temporal power would survive or not depended on the methods of the Papal Government. In the modern *régime* there are certain freedoms which are essential, such as freedom of the press. Now, said

[1] p. 218. [2] p. 221. [3] p. 341. [4] p. 342.

Ollivier, quoting Lacordaire, the Papal Government is a government of the *ancien régime*. That is its weakness. That is to say, added Ollivier, it does not allow the freedom which is essential to modern ideas. Consequently the destinies of the Papacy as a temporal power are neither in the hands of France nor in those of Italy, but in its own.

"If the Pope acts on principles indispensable to all civilized governments in the nineteenth century; if he grants his people what they have the right to demand; if he concedes the essentials of freedom, the temporal power might endure. But if he persists in a resistance which has already been prolonged for seventeen years; if he refuses the counsels of liberals like Thiers, and of Catholics like Montalembert; if, instead of receiving the petitions of his pious and devoted children, he answers by such acts as the Encyclical, in that case the temporal power is doomed."[1]

Ollivier was a religious-minded man, but not a Catholic. He was outside the sphere of the Pope's authority; yet Pius had reasons on the whole to rely on him, in spite of, perhaps because of, the outspoken character of his criticisms. But that the Archbishop of Paris should be aloof, independent, and critical, was another matter. The Archbishop's explanation of the Syllabus, by which the document was explained away, greatly offended the Pope. And Darboy's speech on the temporal power made things worse. Pius complained to the French Ambassador of Darboy's attitude. The Pope observed that when Darboy was translated to the see of Paris he made professions of filial submission. Since then he declared

[1] T. vii. p. 362.

himself ignorant of certain Papal Bulls because those documents were not promulgated in France. This excuse, said Pius, was hardly serious. It was Gallicanism tending to schism. The Pope ought to speak, and he will speak. Ollivier reports that the Ambassador suggested the advisability of prudence. Pius replied that he quite realized the necessity of prudence. He would follow the course of canonical admonition; first in private, then before witnesses, and if these failed he should tell it unto the Church.[1]

Lack of courage was not one of the defects of Pius IX. He was as good as his threat. He sent Darboy one of the fiercest letters of private admonition ever sent to a Bishop. Darboy took no notice. But this confidential letter was somehow published. The French Government expressed its displeasure; the Papal Secretary of State his regret: but the mischief was done. The Archbishop of Paris afterwards, when in Rome, reproached the Pope with this to his face.

Certainly Pius IX. had exceedingly strong reasons for gratitude towards France. He depended on the protection of France for his independence of Italy. Napoleon wrote to the King of Italy in sympathy with Italian consolidation, but at the same time expressing his determination to maintain the Papal temporal power by all possible means.[2] The Pope, wishing to show his gratitude, conferred the Cardinalate upon one of the Emperor's relatives.[3] But the Emperor was not satisfied. He wanted to see his Grand Almoner Darboy made a Cardinal, and wrote requesting it. Pius replied that the advancement of Mgr. Darboy depended on the Archbishop of Paris more than on the Pope. Napoleon persisted, and claimed the right of

[1] p. 497. [2] T. ix. p. 32. [3] T. x. p. 276.

his crown to alternate nominations of French Cardinals with those created by the Pope's own choice. Hearing that a Consistory was shortly to be held, he wrote to Pius again. He could not see why a prelate judged worthy by the sovereign Pontiff to occupy the Archiepiscopal See of Paris should be incapable of discharging the functions of a non-resident Cardinal. But the immovable Pius left Darboy out. Antonelli replied that it was a matter of conscience with the Pope, who had expressly declared, when he made Darboy Archbishop, that he would never confer the Cardinal's rank upon him.[1] The Emperor professed himself greatly pained by the Pope's requital of his services to Rome. But Ollivier admits that the promotion of a Gallican on the eve of the Council which was designed to give the mortal blow to Gallicanism, was more than could be expected.[2]

Ollivier has written a separate work on the Church and State at the Council of the Vatican, where the story is told at considerable length and with extraordinary attractiveness, and with much independence of judgment. But here, in his history of the *Liberal Empire,* he has given his later and most matured reflections on that ecclesiastical event, setting it in its proper place in relation to the religious development of France.

Ollivier points out that up to the time of the Vatican Council Popes were not accustomed to assemble Ecumenical Councils without previously consulting the sovereigns.[3] And when the Council had been summoned it was usual to invite the sovereigns to send their representatives. Napoleon III was not disposed to resign any traditional prerogative ;

[1] p. 475. [2] p. 478. [3] p. 586.

he therefore complained to the Pope that time-honoured precedents were being ignored. Pius excused himself on the ground that Victor Emmanuel was excommunicated, and that Austria was estranged. Therefore he had not invited sovereigns to attend.

Ollivier considers the Pope's expedient dangerous, because it implied that very separation between Church and State which in the Syllabus Pius had denounced.[1]

The Bull summoning the Council of the Vatican caused much dismay among the laity in France as well as among the clergy. They feared that the Council would hopelessly alienate modern society from the Church. The language of the Jesuit journal in Rome, the *Civilta Cattolica,* to whose utterances a semi-official character was not infrequently ascribed, increased their alarm by its exasperating expressions on such subjects as the punishment of heresy and schism by the Church through the instrumentality of the State : a subject which the existing dependence of the Papacy on France made curiously ironical.[2]

The matter was brought before the French Chamber. Protests were made against subsidizing a Church which advocated principles subversive of political power.

Ollivier acknowledged that certain imperial rights existed in relation to Ecumenical Councils. These rights were exercised in the Council of Trent. He admitted that these rights remained; but he questioned the advisability of their exercise. Everything had changed. Where, he asks, is our ancient Church of France, that noble Gallican Church ? It had become reduced to a memory. Its maxims were given up. Priests were

[1] p. 588. [2] p. 589.

now, as Cardinal Bonnechose himself informed the Senate, a mere regiment to march exactly as it is told. No Diocesan Synod, no Provincial Council, protected the priesthood any more. The Bishops themselves were now considered to hold their jurisdiction from the Pope and not from the Apostles. Enslaved to Roman Congregations, not daring to speak or act with the freedom formerly characteristic of the French, they were reduced to the position of mere curates to the Pope.[1] Ollivier spoke in similar terms of the absolute despotism of the Pope.

What was it possible to do under such conditions? The separation between Church and State was being perpetrated by the Pope himself, since he summoned a Council and ignored the Emperor.

As to subsidizing the Church: that, said Olliver, was a debt which the State was just as much bound to regard as the national debt itself.

But on the doctrine hovering over the Roman Church, the Minister of Worship said that the Infallibility of the Pope was not acknowledged by the immense majority of French clergy, nor by the immense majority of the French Episcopate.[2]

Ollivier did not regard this statement as correct so far as the French priests were concerned. The action of Pius IX. in authorizing an appeal for French priests from their Bishop to himself, had created a fanatical devotion to the Papacy on the part of the French priests.[3] Ultramontanism became a positive passion among clergy liberated by the Pope from the despotism of their Bishops. This gave Pius tremendous power in France. He compelled the introduction of the Roman liturgy. The Seminarist teaching, even in the diocese

[1] T. x. p. 592. [2] p. 597. [3] T. xiii. p. 115.

of a Dupanloup, became infallibilist.[1] Accordingly, says Ollivier, Pius IX., being sure of France, took larger flights. He declared on his own authority the Immaculate Conception: the Bishops merely listening, and not acting as judges of the faith of the Church. That decree paved the way towards Infallibility. Then Pius subjected the Vatican Council to his own authority. Whereas at the Council of Trent the Bishops took the initiative, at the Vatican Pius overruled their deliberations, and determined the subjects for their discussion, and the time to discuss them.

France as a nation naturally exercised a powerful influence over the movements of the Vatican. Lavigerie, Archbishop of Algiers, afterwards Cardinal, interviewed Ollivier in Paris, and informed him confidentially as to the state of affairs at the Council in Rome. An immense majority was in favour of the definition. Whatever men might attempt, it was bound to come. The Archbishop therefore suggested to the statesman that instead of fruitless resistance, the efforts of the Moderates would be better employed in securing some modification in the terms of the definition: making it, in fact, such that Bossuet could sign it. Ollivier appears to have been much influenced by this view. He sent a message to Rome to the effect that the French Government regarded the controversy as one relating to the inner organization of the Church, and therefore outside its sphere. The Council could therefore pursue its way in peace, undisturbed by fear of interference from without.[2] Opinion was, however, divided within the Government upon the matter. One member, Daru, objected strongly to this policy of abstention, made various efforts to induce not only

[1] p. 116. [2] T. xiii. p. 166.

the Government of his nation but also other European Powers to protest. He was only partially successful in those attempts. Finally he resigned and Ollivier's policy prevailed.[1] Rome knew that it had no reason to fear interference from France.

The passing of the Infallibility Decree, the withdrawal of French support, the Franco-Prussian War, the union of Italy, the loss of the temporal power : all these are successively related in Ollivier's volumes. His own supreme interest was in the Franco-Prussian War, to which he had consented, and whose disastrous consequences led him to write these sixteen volumes as his apology. This part and its purposes are entirely beyond our sphere. But it is impossible to read these volumes without gaining very considerable insight into the ecclesiastical affairs of France from 1848 to 1871.

[1] p. 201.

VII

D'HULST AND DUCHESNE

THE name of Mgr. d'Hulst is comparatively unknown to Englishmen. He never attracted attention in this country, or exerted the influence of Dupanloup or Lacordaire. And yet in some respects his life is even more instructive than theirs. For it illustrates in a very marked degree the difficulties experienced by the Church when confronted by the problems of modern thought.

Maurice d'Hulst was born at Paris in 1841. He came of aristocratic descent with the strongest Royalist sympathies. For generations his family had been in the service of the Court and the Monarchy. He was associated throughout his career with the House of Orleans, and was an intimate personal friend from childhood of the Comte de Paris.

His story has been told in French at great length in the two volumes of Baudrillart's biography.

D'Hulst was a devoted Roman, with a keen appreciation of modern critical thought. As a youth he was placed under the direction of Dechamp, the extreme ultramontane, afterwards Cardinal-Archbishop of Malines. But Dechamp's influence did nothing to neutralize d'Hulst's sympathy with the liberal theological school. He attended Franzelin's lectures in Rome. But the mediævalism of that celebrated

teacher seems to have left him equally unaffected. He could not endure the hard and prejudiced tone customary in Roman circles toward the liberal Catholics of France. On hearing in the house of Cardinal Pie harsh judgments spoken on Montalembert and Gratry, he could not restrain his tears. He was in Rome in December, 1864, when the Encyclical *Quanta cura* appeared, and was profoundly bewildered and distressed by the reactionary mediævalism of Pius IX. But he forced himself to acquiesce in the view that certain modern liberties, such as the liberty of the press, are only an inevitable concession to an unfortunate state of society.

It would be interesting to know what were d'Hulst's reflections on the Vatican Decree of Papal Infallibility in 1870. We are told that he wrote upon the Council. But we are neither told what he wrote nor where he wrote it. The whole subject is relegated to a footnote in Baudrillart's biography, while the readers' interest is directed to the war of 1870, and the noble service done by d'Hulst in ministrations to the wounded. Thus in the stirring scenes of war the problem of theology is allowed to disappear.

D'Hulst seemed designed by nature and training for a studious rather than an active career. Circumstances, however, conspired to throw him in a practical rather than a studious direction. His social distinctions, combined with his intellectual abilities, marked him out for service among the higher clergy of France. He became literary secretary to Mgr. Guibert, Cardinal-Archbishop of Paris.

Instead of a congenial life of study and preaching, his daily task was to write official letters under the Archbishop's supervision. Guibert's method was to

dictate a brief outline of the subject, leaving to his secretary the task of literary composition. The Archbishop then carefully erased from the letter every characteristic of phrase and style which would betray the authorship, and finally issued the document in a form undistinguishable from compositions of his own.

In this useful but wearisome secretarial routine d'Hulst seemed likely to spend the best of his years. His next appointment seemed but little better. Guibert made him Archdeacon of Saint-Denis, an office which absorbed him in all the details of ecclesiastical administration in the poorer environs of Paris.

However, with the year 1875 there came a change. It was the year when the Catholic University of Paris was founded. One of the principal reasons for its creation was an increasing sense of the inadequacy of existing institutions to provide for the higher intellectual training of the clergy. The great seminaries were felt to be too much aloof from contemporary thought, and too ignorant of critical methods to produce a really accomplished clergy competent to meet the intellectual requirements of the age. Whatever might be truly said in behalf of the seminaries as schools of piety, they could not be termed relatively to the times, schools of sound learning. The historical text-books set before the seminarist were too often quite uncritical, aiming at edification rather than accuracy. The Biblical expositions were superficial, and evasive of real difficulties. The apologetic arguments were designed to meet the objections of a bygone age. Loisy's *Choses Passés*, to say nothing of Renan's *Souvenirs de ma Jeunesse*, provoke the wonder whether a training more adapted to modern needs might

not have saved for the service of Christianity some who have forsaken it.

Whatever the answer to this may be, such a backward condition of higher studies in the Church required a remedy. A teaching more critical, more strictly historical, more scientific, penetrating much more carefully and frankly into problems of interpretation, was with the Roman Church an imperative necessity.

Into the creation of such an Institution for Paris d'Hulst threw himself with all his energies. It is not too much to say that but for him the Catholic University would not have existed. He was the heart and soul of the movement; adroit, prudent, persistent, indefatigable. It was he who pushed on the old Cardinal of Paris into action, and through him brought the other Bishops into harmony. Their cautions, their suspicions, their fears, their reluctance to sanction the expenditure requisite to such an enterprise on an adequate scale, were, after endless difficulties, overcome, and the Catholic Institute became an accomplished fact. D'Hulst was all through the first five years merely a subordinate. But it was impossible not to see that he was the chief in spirit and power, although not in title. His nomination to the Rectorship was bound to come. It came in 1880. For sixteen years d'Hulst ruled over his own creation, and his whole career is identified with its vicissitudes.

The aim of the Catholic Institute of Paris was theoretically one which admitted no dispute. But in practice, the risks were serious. There were elements which might easily come into disastrous collision. For, on the one hand, the indispensable condition of research is freedom: on the other hand, Authority

must protect the Faith. Thus the rights of the individual to unrestricted research might clash with the rights of the Community to protect its principles.

The individual must have the freedom to inquire what is true. But if the same individual is also the servant and exponent of the principles of a Community, he cannot reasonably demand the freedom to proclaim his conclusions within the Community should they be adverse to the principles of the Community. Every individual has the right to say what he considers to be true. But no individual has the right to negative the principles of a Community while commissioned to represent that Community.

So far the rights of the unit and the rights of the Community seem clear. But the problem is complicated when Authority extends its province. Authority must defend the principles for which the Community exists. It must protect the Faith. And so long as the Faith is understood to mean the revealed Truth, in the sense of the unalterable doctrines which constitute the Catholic Religion, the duty of Authority is obvious. But Authority, in the Roman form of it, tends to enlarge its sphere far beyond the doctrines of the actual Creed, and to include many things which have no claim to be of Faith at all. Many a scholastic opinion acquires a rank scarcely second to dogmas of the Faith. Theological theories, for instance, of the nature of Inspiration, came to be regarded as inviolable. Traditions which cannot be critically proved to be more than mediæval, are grouped in uncritical devotion and popular esteem with those which are truly Apostolic. The interests of edification become urged as a reason for rejecting a critical exposition or a historic view. The faith of the average believer is

assumed to be so frail, so delicate, so precarious, that it cannot stand the shocks of criticism, nor the removal of a time-honoured local tradition about some particular Church or saint. Thus, in France, the backwardness of the seminary instruction and the well-meaning fervour of the ignorant devout rendered the aims of a d'Hulst liable to serious opposition from several influential directions.

These difficulties were experienced by d'Hulst in the case of the Abbé Duchesne.

Duchesne had been a student in Rome, where d'Hulst had met him. At d'Hulst's instigation, not, however, without Episcopal misgivings and opposition, he was proposed as Professor of History in the Catholic Institute in 1877; when the Abbé de Broglie, also not without misgivings, was made Professor of Apologetics. The misgivings about Duchesne were not unnatural from the French Episcopal point of view. For already the historian had produced an Essay on the *Liber Pontificalis*, in which he had dealt trenchantly with several records of the Papacy. As soon as this Essay appeared, Mgr. Freppel, former eloquent defender of the Roman view in his lectures on the Early Fathers at the Sorbonne, and now himself a Bishop, determined to get the Essay condemned at Rome. Duchesne, warned of his danger, sent the work to the Secretary of the Congregation of the Index, with an undertaking to accept such corrections as the Sacred Congregation might require. The Roman authorities sent the author the remarks of some Roman theologians, which Duchesne undertook to regard in the prolegomena to his edition of the *Liber Pontificalis*. Roman personages, however, shook their heads over the historian's rashness, but said that Rome would exercise such clemency

as the author's promises deserved. "The word 'clemency,'" echoed Duchesne, "is quite in the Roman style. It does not clearly say what it is proposed to do or avoid."

However, for some five years Duchesne professed in comparative security, not without distant clouds and uncomfortable lack of cordial trust in the Governing Council. D'Hulst was on the defensive, and took precautions. A copy of Duchesne's Lectures was submitted to his inspection. He could defend his colleague the better if he knew exactly what he said. But naturally, in course of time, Duchesne, with his widening reputation, grew too distinguished for such supervision. At last a crisis came in 1882,[1] when Duchesne resolved to appeal to a wider world than the lecture-room, and published his *Origines Chrétiennes*. Thereupon arose a vehement opposition. Duchesne admitted the principle of development. He acknowledged the inadequacy of the Trinitarian statements in several of the great writers in the ante-Nicene period. It was this which roused the opposition. Had not Bossuet asserted the orthodoxy of the ante-Nicenes against the Protestant Jurieu? If Bossuet was mistaken, then Jurieu was the victor after all.

D'Hulst failed at first to realize the force of the Opposition, and recommended Duchesne to work on fearlessly, and meanwhile to reply in one of the Reviews. D'Hulst himself wrote publicly in Duchesne's support. The professor, in adopting the theory of development, had not gone further than Petavius long ago, or Cardinal Newman recently.[2] Still the opposition increased, and assumed a very practical shape.

M. Icard, Superior-General of Saint-Sulpice, issued

[1] p. 459. [2] p. 461.

an order to all his students, forbidding them to attend any further the lectures of Duchesne. This blow was effective, disconcerting, disastrous. It withdrew the chief portion of his pupils. It was a public assertion of distrust. It affected the prestige of the Institute itself. Duchesne was deeply hurt, and complained to d'Hulst. But the Rector had no remedy. Duchesne then asked leave of absence for a year, on the pretext that he needed time to complete his edition of the *Liber Pontificalis*. The Abbé Largent, Professor hitherto of Patrology, took Duchesne's position for the year 1882–3.

But the trouble spread. Theologians were stirred in Rome. Cardinal Franzelin wrote a lengthy letter to d'Hulst, expressing himself greatly concerned that German theories rather than Roman doctrine should prevail in the Catholic Institute of Paris. He warned the Rector that special theories propounded by the venerable Cardinal Newman were not an example to be followed; least of all should they be introduced into Catholic schools.

D'Hulst said what he could in behalf of his colleague. But there was the Episcopal Council of the Institute to be satisfied. Accordingly, in order to save Duchesne, while conciliating the Cardinal and exonerating the Bishops, it was diplomatically decided to create a second Professorship of Ecclesiastical History for the Abbé Largent; leaving the students at liberty to follow either the course of Largent or that of Duchesne. The students from Saint-Sulpice invariably "chose" Largent, says Baudrillart, while Duchesne was advised to direct his attention to general history.

For two years this arrangement succeeded. But in 1885 fresh trouble arose over the question whether

the Churches of France were founded in the Apostolic age. It is not easy to see why this ancient dispute should have roused at this particular period such excitement among the French devout.[1] Hénault, librarian of Chartres, wrote a volume in which he maintained that the Churches of Chartres, Sens, and Orleans were founded by two of the seventy disciples of Christ, Saint Savinian and Saint Potentian.[2] This attempt to re-establish a late mediæval tradition was too much for Duchesne. With his masterly knowledge he threw himself into the task of demolishing the idea.[3]

But unfortunately for d'Hulst and for the Catholic Institute, Duchesne's attempted refutation of the tradition of Sens was resented by the Archbishop as an insult to his See. He threatened not only to withdraw the support of his diocese from the Catholic Institute, where such daring innovations were allowed, but to refer the matter to the authorities in Rome.

D'Hulst attempted again to defend his colleague.

The Archbishop of Sens replied that Duchesne's article was very bad both in substance and in form. It supported the old errors of the Jansenist school. It endeavoured to undermine Apostolical traditions. It called a great Benedictine Abbey, which had been a nursery of saints, a workshop of falsified documents. It threw doubt on tradition contained in liturgical books which had the sanction of Rome. Accordingly, the Archbishop was resolved to appeal to the central authorities, and to obtain satisfaction for this gratuitous disrespect.

[1] p. 446.

[2] Hénault, *Origines Chrétiennes de la Gaule Celtique.*

[3] See Houtin, *La Controverse de l'Apostolicité des Églises de France.*

Between the man of edification and the man of learning, the man of large sympathies and conciliatory character once more attempted to mediate. D'Hulst did his best to explain the method of the critical historians. He pointed out that admiration for the mediæval saints had rendered a certain school of writers incapable of crediting the fact of falsified documents. The work of Duchesne, he pleaded, was a reaction from the exaggerations of a legendary school. No doubt Duchesne went to extremes, both in substance and in form, but after all so did the school from which he reacted. Moreover, the presence of these traditions in liturgical books could not be fairly regarded as a conclusive endorsement of their historic reality, since Rome itself had revised the stories of the Breviary, and had omitted certain stories about the Popes themselves. And further still, urged d'Hulst, it would be an astonishing course if Rome intervened in a purely historical question which had nothing whatever to do with the essence of the Faith.

It was difficult for the Archbishop of Sens not to feel the force of d'Hulst's remonstrance. But he took refuge behind the objection that such writings do not tend to edification. They upset the faithful, and were resented by the clergy. His conscience compelled him to do his duty as a Bishop, and to defend the glorious prerogatives of his See.

Men never do evil more effectively and more serenely, said Pascal, than when they do it conscientiously on mistaken principles.

The Archbishop of Sens proceeded to circularize the Bishops of the Provinces of Sens and of Paris, inviting them to unite with him in denouncing Duchesne to Rome.

What would have happened if Rome had been invoked it is difficult to say. But d'Hulst found himself in an extremely awkward position. He could not in the interests of the Institute allow its orthodoxy to be perpetually suspected in Rome. Nor could the Episcopal Council of the Institute easily be satisfied. The pressure brought to bear against him by the Archbishop of Sens was more than he could resist : anxious as he certainly was to defend Duchesne ; to retain that gifted historian, whose extraordinary learning and penetration was in his eyes one of the most valuable distinctions which the Catholic Institute possessed. But the pressure was too strong, and in the end Duchesne was compelled to resign.

It would not, of course, be correct to say that his criticism of the Apostolic founding of the Church of Sens was the sole cause of Duchesne's dismissal from his professorship at the Institute. There were other grounds. His adoption of the theory of development in doctrine, his admission that ante-Nicene Fathers wrote inadequately on the Trinitarian Faith, his treatment of the Papal records in the *Liber Pontificalis :* all these contributed to the same result. But the whole objection to him was as a critical historian. His demolition of the traditions of Sens was his crowning offence. But it was only one application of the modern historical method. This experience seems to show that within the Roman sphere Authority is not content with the protection of the Faith, but that it can allow the critical historian no liberty of independent interpretation, no liberty to sift the reported facts, if the conscientious resentment of the ignorant devout causes truth to seem hurtful to the interests of piety. This is a lamentable condition.

D'Hulst felt the case acutely, no less than Duchesne. Nine years after Duchesne's dismissal it was still rankling in his mind. He had the courage to give powerful expression, before the Catholic Congress of 1894, of his sense of the desperateness of clinging, on the ground of sentiment, to mediæval traditions about the supposed Apostolic founding of the Churches in France. D'Hulst admitted that where much erudition had been expended, and the learned were still unable to agree, it must be difficult to decide. But he urged that the question, Who founded the Churches of France? does not belong to the sphere of religious faith. For religious faith is concerned with that which is revealed. Now, it is not revealed that Lazarus and Mary Magdalene came to Marseilles, or St. Denys the Areopagite to Paris. Certain persons, however, who believe in these traditions are ready to denounce adherence to the contrary opinion as rationalism and want of faith. What sort of faith, asks d'Hulst, is this of which they speak? It cannot be Divine or Catholic faith. For the point in question has nothing to do with Catholic faith. Then it can only be human faith. And human faith must depend on reasons. And these reasons cannot be beyond discussion. Doubtless Tradition is one of the sources from which Dogma is derived. But that is only the case when the Tradition conveys Apostolic teaching. To identify the Universal Tradition with the local traditions of a particular Church is a confusion of thought and a misuse of terms. The date, for instance, of the founding of the Church of Paris is a question of fact, which must be investigated by critical and historical methods. If d'Hulst can establish that his Church originated in the Apostolic age, he will be proud to do it. But if a conscientious

study leads him to another conclusion, he will not on that account think himself any the less a Christian.[1]

These bold but somewhat obvious remarks are an excellent illustration of d'Hulst's fearless character. It is interesting to note that in the year following upon this speech, the French Government set Duchesne at the head of the French School in Rome.

The historian's troubles were, however, by no means ended. He began to publish his great work, *Histoire Ancienne de l'Église*, of which three volumes have now appeared. It is a work of massive learning, relieved by brilliant insight and caustic humour.[2] Probably this last has been the author's chief offence to the conservative theologians in Rome. There is a subtle irony which Duchesne is unable to resist.[3] It is liable to misconstruction and, to members of an older school, exasperating. Perhaps it was the form even more than the substance which roused hostility. In any case, hostility was roused. And this masterpiece of Catholic history, which might well be the pride of any Christian Community, was relegated to the Index in Rome.

[1] Vol. i. p. 556.
[2] Cf. Baudrillart, i. p. 464.
[3] Cf. Turner, *Quarterly Review*, 1914.

VIII

D'HULST AND LOISY

It is the strangest irony, in view of subsequent events, and after the incident of Duchesne, to find d'Hulst requesting the Episcopal Council of the Institute to sanction the nomination of Loisy as Professor of Holy Scripture. There was some rivalry between the Bishop of Châlons and the Rector of the Institute which of them should secure the services of this invaluable teacher. This was in 1882.

Ten years later, however, trouble began. Loisy founded the Journal *l'Enseignement biblique* for the publication of his critical ideas. He soon began to parallel the experience of Duchesne. Just as M. Icard, Superior-General of Saint-Sulpice, had withdrawn his students from the lectures of Duchesne, so now he withdrew them from those of Loisy.

It was the year of Renan's death (1892). D'Hulst, with the very best intentions, thought it well to send an article on Renan to the *Correspondant*. It was written partly to lead French Catholics toward a more impartial judgment on the distinguished author just deceased, and partly to shield Loisy from adverse movements at Rome, where his journal was said to be in peril of being condemned.

D'Hulst laid stress on Renan's extraordinary abilities, the power of his descriptions, the fascination of his

style. He owned that their very attractiveness made his books all the more dangerous. But, on the other hand, he reminded French believers that Renan, unlike many perverts, never abused the religion which he had forsaken, and had nothing to say of the French priesthood but what was good. Renan's reminiscences were full of tributes to their excellence. Renan had indeed perverted the sublimity of the Gospel by many a blasphemous insinuation. But this did not justify any one in denying him originality and power. Renan was being judged by men of two opposite extremes. The believing said that Renan had known the truth and denied it, and therefore could not be sincere. The sceptical said that Renan had every worldly motive for adherence to religion, and yet had the moral courage and intellectual consistency to risk everything for his opinions. D'Hulst held that the true judgment on Renan lay between these two extremes. The case of Renan is not unique. It constantly reappears. D'Hulst contended that their wisdom was to leave the man to the Divine judgment, and commend him to the Divine mercy; and, for our own edification, to dwell on the thought of responsibility in matters of faith.

Unquestionably we cannot lose our faith without our fault. To that extent the believer's judgment on Renan was correct. But they are wrong in forgetting the complexity of human motives, and the fact that the final severance is the consummation of a process which we often cannot trace. They are also wrong in judging the force of an objection merely by its weight upon themselves, and in characterizing as frivolous and worthless difficulties whose real force they do not feel. It was perfectly useless to talk as if a study of the sacred documents presented no grave difficulties.

The doctrine of inspiration, for instance, implying the veracity of the sacred books, necessarily awakens difficulty when the critic is confronted with statements which he cannot reconcile with other parts of the narrative or with historical facts outside.

Baudrillart says that this line of treatment for an "apostate" was so unfamiliar to Catholic writers,[1] whether clerical or lay, that it caused astonishment and even scandal, especially among those priests who were unaccustomed to an intellectual atmosphere.

Veuillot's Journal *l'Univers,* habitual opponent to the *Correspondant,* opened an attack on the Rector of the Catholic Institute. According to the Abbé Moniquet, leader of the attack, d'Hulst's attitude was simply Rationalism in the province of faith.[2] The Conservative School gathered its forces against the more Progressive.

D'Hulst's article was composed with the most pacific intentions. But it had precisely the opposite effect. It did Loisy no good, but rather harm. It drew hostility upon the Rector himself. Well meant, but not diplomatic, it greatly increased the storm.

Nor was this all. D'Hulst was now launched in the sea of controversy. Misconstructions, misunderstandings multiplied. He felt himself compelled to give still further explanations. Accordingly he published in the *Correspondant* an article on *la Question biblique.*[3] Here d'Hulst pleaded the urgent necessity of reform in apologetic methods. The conventional method was to establish the fact of Revelation by appeal to the Old Testament. D'Hulst argued that the modern apologist must abandon this method since the modern objections to the Mosaic revelation render such appeals entirely ineffective.

[1] Vol. ii. p. 139. [2] Vol. ii. p. 139. [3] Jan. 25, 1893.

D'Hulst discussed the question of Biblical mistakes. These are usually classified as errors in science and errors in history. As to the former, the apologist evaded them by affirming that the Bible contained no teaching about science. But the historical difficulty could not be solved that way. Revelation rests on history. If many difficulties are solved, many remain. Scripture contains legends analogous to those of other Religions.

D'Hulst went further into the difficult problem of Inspiration. God, said d'Hulst, is the author of Scripture ; but He is not the sole author. There is a human author as well. God is the principal author ; but the human author, while under the transcendent influence of the Inspirer, retains a relative independence. God is the responsible author. But to what extent is He responsible ? Is it for the words ? D'Hulst says No. Is it for the substance ? D'Hulst says Yes. But, granting this, a crowd of problems remain. Loisy and Cardinal Newman, Lenormant, and de Broglie would not answer them in exactly the same way. Lenormant, it is true, had the misfortune to find himself on the Index. Possibly, however, d'Hulst suggests this was only because his theories were not thought out.

The question is not, says d'Hulst, whether the Bible contains history, but whether everything which seems historical is revealed as such, or guaranteed by inspiration.

D'Hulst maintains that there are serious difficulties in holding that absolute freedom from error is a necessary result of inspiration.

Here enter the rights of criticism. And d'Hulst had the courage to affirm that the orthodox school of

interpretation was in a stage of transition, and that conservative timidity was often much less prudent than the boldness of the newer school.

As an overture for peace nothing could be more reasonable or better meant than d'Hulst's intervention. As an act of diplomacy nothing could be more unwise. D'Hulst's knowledge of the state of French and Roman Catholic thought and prejudice ought to have warned him of the danger of identifying himself with the strife.

The not unnatural consequence of d'Hulst's article on the Biblical Question was to raise considerable suspicion and criticism in Rome against himself, not only for tolerating such teaching as that of Loisy in the Catholic Institute, but for maintaining such novel theories of Inspiration on his own account.

Strangely enough d'Hulst does not appear to have realized in the least the effect of his article until he visited Rome. There he learnt at once to his surprise and dismay the high probablitity that his own article would be condemned. Italian theologians of the type of Franzelin and Mazella were moving heaven and earth to get d'Hulst denounced. D'Hulst had more to think of now than his own personal fate. The condemnation of the Rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris would be vastly more than a *fiasco* for himself; it would be a most disastrous blow upon the Institute itself. The Institute was yet in its early days; it had its enemies; it had its reputation to make. Its brief existence was by no means above suspicion. It had been erected expressly to raise the intellectual level of the French priest, and to succeed where other Institutions had failed. It was on its trial. A condemnation from Rome would not only seriously diminish its prestige, it would be an effective refutation of its pre-

tensions. D'Hulst saw no way to avoid a papal pronouncement. It was clear that the Pope was determined to speak. His only hope was that an encyclical might be issued dealing only with principles and making no reference to persons.

While resident in Rome for this purpose d'Hulst received, he says, the letters and visits of many a Nicodemus who bade him hold firm; in other words, he adds, be sacrificed for their advantage. The intellectual movement which d'Hulst represented existed in Rome as it did elsewhere. There were numerous intelligent students there who groaned under the burden of their limitations. But these men were not the officials. They were not members of the Congregation of the Index. As for the opinion that Rome is the best place for attaining truth because there the outlook is universal, d'Hulst says he was totally unable to agree with it. They hardly see anything at all; because, instead of taking a universal outlook, they only look into a literature which is obsolete. D'Hulst, at any rate, learnt caution in Rome. He carefully avoided an interview with Cardinal Rampolla, because the Secretary of State was displeased with his political standpoint, and might put obstructions in the way of an interview with the Pope. However, he had a private audience with Leo XIII. and left assured that, whatever was coming, there would be no personal condemnation.

Back in Paris d'Hulst had to meet the Episcopal Council of the Institute on the case of Loisy. Naturally enough the Bishops were alarmed. Equally naturally the Rector's influence was less. Uncertainty prevailed as to what Rome would do, and whether d'Hulst himself might not be personally involved in condemnation.

He was therefore forced to take some measure to reassure the authorities. They could not have forgotten the case of Duchesne. Accordingly d'Hulst proposed to the Episcopal Council that Loisy should be requested to confine his attention to Hebrew grammar, an dthat the perils of Biblical interpretation should be entrusted to some one else.

Loisy consented. But it was not in his nature to sacrifice the problems of criticism to the exigencies of administration. It was not long before he launched on the world an article on Biblical Inspiration which filled the French Episcopate with dismay. None were more disturbed than the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris. When the Episcopal Council met it was proposed to give Loisy the alternative either to suppress his journal or to resign his professorship. Even this alternative was not held by the majority to be drastic enough. Ultimately it was resolved to request him to send in his resignation.

Meanwhile d'Hulst was in suspense as to the fate of his own article at Rome. He was not long kept waiting. In November, 1893, shortly after Loisy's removal, appeared the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus.* D'Hulst's hopes were so far realized that no individual was condemned by name. But the theories of inspiration to which d'Hulst stood committed, or which he had favourably expounded in his article on the Biblical Question, were condemned without hesitation. Up to the last moment, so rumour reported, strenuous efforts were made by Italian theologians to induce the Pope to condemn the Rector of the Institute by name. Cardinal Mazella, author of great systematic treatises, did his utmost to secure this. D'Hulst heard from friends in Rome that there were positive scenes between

the Cardinal and the Pope about it. Leo refused to go as far as this, but he declared in his Encyclical that the attempt to escape from Biblical difficulties by confining inspiration to matters of faith and morals could not possibly be permitted. Divine inspiration, said the Pope, by its very nature excludes all error.

The entire professorial staff of the Catholic Institute, with d'Hulst at their head, sent in at once to Rome a letter of submission. D'Hulst thought it well to add another letter on his own account, in which he admits that hitherto he had propounded the theory that inspiration guaranteed inerrancy only in the departments of faith and morals. He recognizes that the Encyclical allows him no longer to hold that view. He accepts, like all other Catholics, the Pope's decision; expressing himself at the same time particularly grateful that the Encyclical has confined its condemnation to ideas and has not extended them to persons.

This submission d'Hulst defended on the ground that it is never dishonourable for a son to own himself wrong before his father. There were some to whom this defence was inconclusive. D'Hulst was accused with having sinned against the truth. His reply was characteristic alike of the subtlety and the frankness of his nature. "The Encyclical," said d'Hulst, "has done two things: it has recalled the traditional view of inspiration; and it has forbidden the use of a phrase which custom seems to have permitted hitherto, namely that there are errors in the Bible beyond the departments of faith and morals.

"Henceforward, therefore, an apologist subject to the Holy See ought no longer to allow himself such expressions. But the Pope explicitly acknowledges that Scripture, where it touches upon natural science,

has spoken sometimes in accordance with appearances, sometimes in accordance with contemporary ideas. If these appearances or ideas accepted in antiquity were not in agreement with scientific truth, they were equivalent to what I call by the name of error. However, I submit, and abandon that expression, as it is not considered to be sufficiently respectful to inspiration.

"In its bearing on history the difficulty is greater. But the Encyclical admits the necessity of interpreting the passages which raise these disputes. I should have preferred to be left free to speak of errors in matters of history, where the facts recorded by the sacred historian are not involved in doctrine. I should feel this freedom an advantage to apologetics. It would have freed us from subtleties. The authority of the Holy See requires me to abandon this. I submit with sincerity. But I do not on that account abandon the right to *interpret* that which in its *obvious meaning* creates the difficulty. I see nothing dishonest in this.

"The Roman theologians who have inspired the Encyclical are not infallible. The Pope, in appropriating their thought, has performed an act of discipline but he has not defined a dogma."

D'Hulst's biographer gives us in an interesting passage his opinion on the value of the Rector's part in this incident. He admits that, except for the example of submission, d'Hulst's intervention in the Biblical controversy might seem a mere *fiasco*. He had facilitated the dismissal of the professor whom he sought to protect. He had provoked from the supreme authority an emphatic rejection of the mediating and conciliatory theory for which he sought to find a place in Catholic apologetics, in the hope thereby to reconcile modern criticism with the Church. He had im-

perilled the status of the Catholic Institute of Paris; and he had only the discretion of Leo XIII. to thank for his personal escape from the Index, so compromising to his influence and prestige.

Nevertheless, in Baudrillart's view, d'Hulst's intervention has not been without advantages, and has even, in a certain way, rendered service to the Church. There were people upon whose minds his dispassionate judgment on Renan's career made a deep and beneficial impression.

We may recognize that this is true. Yet whether d'Hulst's impartiality drew people towards himself or towards the Church is another matter. For d'Hulst's merciful judgment on Renan was not generally endorsed; and his broader theory of inspiration was officially prohibited.

The action of the Roman Curia does not exhibit the Church in an attractive light. We realize the need of authority. We may be painfully conscious of the inevitable confusions which ensue where authority is in abeyance. But these incidents illustrate how disadvantageous authority may become when it encroaches beyond the sphere of faith and morals, and stereotypes a mediæval or scholastic view; when it defends a local tradition against historical research, and raises the interest of a particular Church almost upon a level with revelation and faith. In such cases it is impossible not to feel that, essential as authority is, neither the welfare of the Church can be secured nor the world be won by such procedures. An emphasis is laid, by such extravagance, on the perils of authority, which is of all things the very lesson which modern tendencies do not require.

APPENDIX

1. For Lamennais see—

Lamennais, *Œuvres complètes.* 12 vols. Paris, 1836.
,, *Œuvres inédites.* 2 vols. 1866. Correspondance.
Articles de l'Avenir. 7 vols. 1831.
Roussel, *Lamennais d'après des documents inédits.* 2 vols. 1893.
D'Haussonville, *Lettres inédites de Lamennais à la Baronne Cottu.* 2nd edit. 1910.
• Boutard, *Lamennais. Sa Vie et ses Doctrines.* 3 vols. 1913.
Forgues, *Lettres inédites de Lamennais à Montalembert.* 1898.
Marechal, *La Jeunesse de La Mennais.* 1913.
,, *La Famille de La Mennais.* 1913.

2. For Lacordaire see—

Lacordaire, *Œuvres de.* 9 vols. 1872. 8vo.
Comte de Falloux, *Correspondance du R. P. Lacordaire et de Madame Swetchine.* 6th edit. 1872.
,, ,, *Madame Swetchine.* 2 vols. 1872.
Montalembert, *Le Père Lacordaire.* 1862.
,, *Le Testament du P. Lacordaire.* 1870.
Chocarne, *Le R.P. H. P. Lacordaire. Sa Vie intime et religieuse.* 2nd edit. 2 vols. 1866.
Lettres inédites du R.P. H. D. Lacordaire. 1874.

3. For Montalembert see—

Montalembert, *Les Moines d'Occident.* 7 vols. 1877.
,, *Discours.* 9 vols. 1860.
• Lecanuet, *Montalembert.* 3 vols. 1911.

4. For Veuillot see—

Louis Veuillot, par Eugène Veuillot (1869–1883). 1913. 4th edit.

Correspondance de Louis Veuillot. 9 vols.

Rome pendant le Concile, par L. Veuillot. Paris, 1876.

5. For Gratry see—

Gratry, *Henri Perreyve.* 1891. 2nd edit.

,, *La Morale.* 1909. 4th edit. 2 vols.

,, *Commentaire sur S. Matthieu.* 2 vols. 1909.

,, *Logique.* 2 vols. 1868.

(*Œuvres Posthumes*) *Souvenirs de ma Jeunesse.* 1876.

,, *La Philosophie du Crédo.* 1864. 2nd edit.

,, *De la Connaissance de l'Ame.* 2 vols. 5th edit. 1874.

,, *De la Connaissance de Dieu.* 2 vols. 8th edit. 1881.

,, *Mgr. l'Evêque d'Orléans et Mgr. l'Archevêque de Malines.* 4 letters. 1870. 4th edit.

Chauvin, *Le Père Gratry* (1805–1872). Paris, 1901.

See also Vacherot.

6. For Ollivier see—

Emile Ollivier, *L'Empire libéral.* 16 vols. Paris, 1912. (A concluding volume was published after the author's death.)

,, ,, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au Concile du Vatican.* 3rd edit. 2 vols.

7. For d'Hulst and Duchesne see—

Mgr. d'Hulst, *Conférences de Notre-Dame.* Carême de 1891. Les Fondements de la Moralité. Paris, 1891, etc., to 1896.

Houtin, *La Question Biblique chez les Catholiques de France au xixe siècle.* 1902.

Baudrillart, *Mgr. d'Hulst.*

D'Hulst, Article on Renan, *Correspondant*, 1892.

Houtin *La Controverse de l'Apostolicité des Eglises de France*

8. For d'Hulst and Loisy see—
Baudrillart, *Mgr. d'Hulst.*
Alfred Loisy, *Autour d'un petit Livre.* 1903. 2nd edit.
Frémont, *Lettres à l'abbé Loisy.* 1904.
Alfred Loisy, *Quelques Lettres sur des Questions actuelles.* 1908.
" " *Choses passées.* 1913.

9. For French Bishops during the period the following biographies may be mentioned:—
Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup.* 3 vols. 1884. Ed. 2.
Faguet, *Mgr. Dupanloup.* 1914.
Foulon, *Histoire de la Vie et des Œuvres de Mgr. Darboy, Archevêque de Paris.* 1889.
Dupanloup, *Nouvelles Œuvres Choisies.*

10. Generally for the period:—
Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet.* 7 vols.
Guizot, *Mémoires.*
Raulx, *Encyclique et Documents.* 2 vols. 1865.
Pierre de la Gorce, *Histoire du Second Empire.* 1894.
Gabriel Hanoteaux, *Contemporary France.* 4 vols. 1870–1900.

WILLIAM BRENDON AND SON, LTD., PRINTERS
PLYMOUTH, ENGLAND

WASHINGTON UNIV.
YEATS
NEW YORK

Studies in Church History

Essays Liturgical and Historical

By J. Wickham Legg, D.Litt., F.S.A.
Cloth Boards, 5s. net.

An Abbot of Vézelay

By Rose Graham, F.R.Hist.S. With Illustrations. Cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.

French Catholics in the 19th Century

By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D., Chaplain St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford.
Cloth boards, 5s. net.

S.P.C.K., LONDON: 68 HAYMARKET, S.W.

6576 4
282.44R
Sp26

Simpson, W. J. S.

French catholics in the nineteenth century.

1919 Oct. 17	Prof Jenks	Feb 24			
1920 16 Mar.	H K Pierce	Jan 20			
1927	3C	18 JAN			

282.44R
Sp26

6576 4